

As to the effort to prohibit the change in our form of government or to overthrow our present form of government and substitute for it some other form of government by peaceful means—which, of course, means by lawful means—I am perfectly sure, upon reflection, the Senator from Tennessee will recognize it is not only impossible to prevent the inculcation of sentiments of that character, but that it would be unwise to attempt to do so in any way, for if there is anything that we prize among all the liberties that we enjoy it is the right to advocate and to urge the change in our form of government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In just a moment. Mr. President, the Declaration of Independence spoke of that as a fundamental right. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Montana, I think, misunderstands or misjudges the amendment which I have offered. The Senator says it would never do to put on our statute books a provision that we could not peaceably change our form of government. This amendment has nothing to do with that. The proposition in my amendment is that if a man peaceably or forcibly undertakes to overthrow the Government, the crime is the overthrow of the Government; and whether he does it peaceably or whether he does it by force is immaterial when he is engaged in the commission of a crime. For instance, it is analogous in a way, though not exactly, to the crime of murder. You can forcibly stick a knife into a man's body and kill him, or you can take a pistol or a gun and forcibly kill him with that; but you might also so arrange that he might kill himself by permitting him to pour poison into his own coffee and kill him, and that would be just as much a crime under our law. I desire to apply that same principle to treason and sedition in this country. I say it is just as much a crime to overthrow the Government peaceably as it is by force.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not misunderstand the Senator. I followed him very carefully; and I still have the same conclusion concerning the amendment which he has offered that I had before his explanation. I dare say that you might kill a man by telling the truth about him; you might tell such unpleasant things about him that he would go into a decline. We have heard of people who have died from joy and who have died from grief.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator say that if I left a poison on the Senator's table, leading him to believe that it was a medicine and would be helpful to him, and the Senator took it and died as the result, that that would be a forcible killing, or would that be a perfectly peaceable killing? Would it not be a crime just the same; and yet would there be the slightest force about it?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Such a killing would be very properly described in an indictment as having been accomplished by force and arms.

Mr. McKELLAR. It might be; but it would be a misnomer and a misuse of terms.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have two other amendments I desire to offer, one on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], who is detained from the Senate on account of illness. They are companion pieces to the amendment which has just been voted upon, and as it is apparent from the vote just taken that the Senate is opposed to the amendments, I shall not detain the Senate by discussing them; but I should like to offer them, so that the RECORD may be complete. First, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was to add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 6. That upon the decree of deportation being entered the person shall be delivered to the United States marshal, together with the transcript of judgment and decree to be furnished by the clerk of the court under seal of the court. The marshal shall then forthwith transport said convicted defendant or defendants to the island of Guam by the most direct and convenient route and deliver him or them to the official representing the United States on said island, and shall also deliver the certified copy of decree to such official in control of said island, who shall enter same upon his records, and said official shall then have jurisdiction of any future proceedings necessary in each case. And the said official shall, upon receiving any such person or persons, make a record of such transaction and shall proceed to such measures in the way of registration, thumb prints, Bertillon measurements, or such other means as he may deem necessary to permanently identify such person as a deported person. The said person or persons

shall then be confined in such place or places as the official in charge of the island shall direct.

SEC. 7. That at any time after 30 days from said order of confinement any person so deported shall have the privilege of filing a petition addressed to the said authority in the island of Guam for permission to be allowed the liberty of the island, and said official shall, in his discretion, issue a parole to said petitioner allowing him the liberty of the island upon such terms and conditions as said official shall determine, but under no such case shall said petitioner be allowed to leave the island.

SEC. 8. That any person or persons who shall aid or assist any deported person or persons to leave said island, or any boat or vessel that shall take any such person as a passenger or otherwise, without the order of the authorities in control of the said island for the United States, shall be guilty of felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or be imprisoned not more than five years, or both, in the discretion of the said authorities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now offer the other amendment referred to by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was to add as a new section at the end of the bill the following:

That every person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching such disbelief or opposition to all organized government, or who advocates or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally of the Government of the United States, or any other organized government, because of his or their official character, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine of \$5,000 and imprisonment of not less than five years for each separate offense, or in lieu of such punishment may be, by order of the court, confined to the island of Guam as hereinafter provided.

That any person who unlawfully aids or assists in the commission of any such offense as hereinabove described, or connives or conspires with any person or persons to allow, procure, or permit the commission of any such offense shall, upon conviction, be guilty of a felony and shall be punished as hereinbefore prescribed for the principal offense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not intend to call for a yeas-and-nays vote on the bill, as there is not a quorum present, but I desire a viva voce vote upon it.

The question being put, the bill was passed.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the consideration of the unfinished business be resumed.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, to repeal section 18 of "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 12, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 10, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we bless Thee for the splendid opportunities afforded in life, for the development of all that is best in us, in the struggle for existence, the overcoming of evil, the unraveling of the mysteries which environ us; to think, to will, to do, achieve, and keep ourselves unspotted from the world; and thus develop to symmetrical proportions all the faculties of mind and soul, which Thou hast bestowed upon us, to perfection—the goal of life—until we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ—the acme of manhood, the paragon of perfection; and all praise shall be Thine, our Father. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and it is clear that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aswell	Fuller, Mass.	Kettner	Riddick
Bacharach	Gallagher	Kincheloe	Riordan
Barkley	Gandy	Kreider	Robinson, N. C.
Bell	Gaully	Langley	Rouse
Benson	Garrett	Linthicum	Rowan
Blackmon	Goldfogle	McClintic	Sanders, Ind.
Bland, Ind.	Good	McClulloch	Sanders, La.
Bland, Mo.	Goodall	McDuffie	Schall
Booher	Graham, Ill.	McKeown	Scully
Britten	Greene, Mass.	McKinley	Siegel
Brooks, Ill.	Hamill	McPherson	Sims
Brooks, Pa.	Hamilton	Mason	Slemp
Browning	Hardy, Colo.	Moon	Smith, Ill.
Caldwell	Harrison	Moore, Ind.	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Hersman	Morin	Snyder
Candler	Hill	Mott	Steele
Carew	Howard	Nicholls, S. C.	Sullivan
Costello	Hudspeth	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.
Crowther	Ireland	O'Connor	Thompson
Cullen	Jefferis	Osborne	Tinkham
Curry, Calif.	Johnson, Ky.	Pell	Wells
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Peters	Winslow
Doeling	Johnson, Wash.	Rainey, J. W.	Woods, Va.
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Rayburn	Woodyard
Egan	Kendall	Reed, N. Y.	Wright
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Rhodes	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

VICTOR L. BERGER.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Victor L. Berger, at the special session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, presented his credentials as a Representative-elect to said Congress from the fifth congressional district of the State of Wisconsin; and

Whereas on November 10, 1919, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 311 to 1 adopted a resolution declaring that "Victor L. Berger is not entitled to take the oath of office as a Representative in this House from the fifth congressional district of the State of Wisconsin or to hold a seat therein as such Representative," by reason of the fact that he had violated a law of the United States, and having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress to support the Constitution of the United States, had given aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States and for other good and sufficient reasons; and

Whereas the said Victor L. Berger now presents his credentials to fill the vacancy caused by his own ineligibility; and

Whereas the same facts exist now which the House determined made the said Victor L. Berger ineligible to a seat in said House as a Representative from said district; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That by reason of the facts herein stated and by reason of the action of the House heretofore taken, the said Victor L. Berger is hereby declared not entitled to a seat in the Sixty-sixth Congress as a Representative from the said fifth district of the State of Wisconsin, and the House declines to permit him to take the oath and qualify as such Representative.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this matter may be disposed of within the hour for which I have been recognized, and immediately before the expiration of the hour it is my purpose to move the previous question. I shall be glad to yield one-half of my time to any Member of the House who may be opposed to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up much of the time of the House. On the opening day of the special session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, in accordance with the precedents of the House, objection was made to the swearing in of Victor L. Berger, a Representative-elect from the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin, and again, in accordance with the precedents of the House, the matter was referred to a special committee to investigate his right to a seat. That committee conducted an exhaustive investigation and reported to the House that they had found as a matter of fact that the said Victor L. Berger had violated a law of the United States and also that, having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress to support the Constitution of the United States, he had given aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States during the war, and therefore was ineligible under the provisions of section 3 of

the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States to membership in this House. The House of Representatives, on November 10, 1919, upon the recommendation of the committee, passed a resolution, which is incorporated in the resolution which is now before the House, declaring that Victor L. Berger was not entitled to a seat in this House. Since the adoption of the resolution of exclusion by the House on November 10 nothing has changed, except that the same man has been voted for by the electors of the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin to fill the vacancy in the same Congress caused by his own ineligibility. He himself has publicly stated that he would again, under the same circumstances, do exactly what he did during the war, only that he would go further than he then went.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this opening statement I desire again to make perfectly clear to this House and to the people of the country that Victor L. Berger has not been excluded and it is not proposed to exclude him from this House because he is a member of the Socialist Party.

That fact is proven by the record of the House itself. This same Victor L. Berger was elected in 1910 as a Socialist Member of Congress, and on the convening of Congress in 1911 no objection was made to his taking his seat. In 1914 and again in 1916 Meyer London was elected a Member of this House as a Socialist from the State of New York, and neither time was the slightest objection made to his being seated. No objection is raised to Victor L. Berger now because he is a member of the Socialist Party or because of his political or economic views. Objection has been made and is now being made because in 1911 he took a solemn oath as a Member of Congress to support the Constitution of the United States and to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and then when war was declared he deliberately gave aid and comfort to the enemies of his country.

There is just one other point I desire to make perfectly clear. It is said that the people of the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin have a right to choose anyone they see fit as a Member of Congress and to have him seated. With that proposition I take serious issue. The people of that district have a right to vote for anyone they see fit, but they, in common with the Members of this House and in common with all the people of this country, are bound by the Constitution of the United States, and if they persist in electing a man whom the House has found is ineligible under that Constitution, they can not expect to have him seated. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I trust this resolution will be adopted. [Applause.] I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois. [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GRIFFIN. To make a parliamentary inquiry. I have an amendment to the proposed resolution in the form of a substitute, and I desire to ask at what time I may be able to introduce it?

The SPEAKER. It depends upon whether the previous question is ordered or not. If the previous question is ordered, the gentleman can not introduce it at all.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I may introduce it, however, by obtaining the recognition of the Chair, I presume?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will pass upon that question when it arises. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is not an enviable task that I am now performing, and yet my feeling as to right and justice in the matter is so strong that I should feel that I were a coward did I not express very briefly the views which I hold. And whatever else I may be, I hope that, in fact, I never will be a coward. [Applause.]

Mr. Berger has been elected anew to this House by a majority of those who voted in his district at the special election, and to me the question is whether we shall maintain inviolate the representative form of government, where people who desire changes in the fundamental or other laws of the land shall have the right to be represented on the floor of this House when they control a majority of the votes in a congressional district.

I do not share the views of Mr. Berger, but I am willing to meet his views in an argument before the people rather than to say that we shall deny him the opportunity to be heard when selected by this people in the legal form, and invite them, in effect, to resort to violence. Mr. Berger, I suppose, believes that there should be fundamental changes in our form of government. He believes, I suppose, that many things which were done concerning the war were wrong. Has it come to the point that a man who believes certain things can not be heard? His

people, his constituents, desire him to represent them. Is it our duty to say to his constituents, "You shall not select one man"? Then, we might quite as well say, "You may not select another." It is not our duty to select a Representative from this congressional district. That is the duty of the people back at home. Gentlemen, we can not take the attitude of refusing to permit the voice of the people of a district to be heard by their own selection with safety to the future of the country. If Mr. Berger believed that the Constitution should be abolished and a new Constitution written in its place, and his people selected him to present those views in the legal body where they could be considered, his people have that right. And when we propose to meet argument by force we are losing our strength in the matter. We can argue these questions before the people.

Let me say that, in my judgment, the times are somewhat critical all over the world. New governments are being raised everywhere. New ideas are being inculcated throughout the various countries of the world. We can only meet these insidious arguments by openly arguing the questions before the people, and unless the people believe that one who thinks the other way has the right to be heard when he properly presents himself, we only add to the discontent and danger.

I am not afraid of the continuance of a representative democratic government in this country. I am not afraid to trust to the final judgment of the people. I am perfectly willing that any constituency shall have the right to select practically whom it pleases to espouse their cause. I am willing to answer their contentions before the people.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I want to know if you think we ought to admit to this House a disloyal man? [Applause.] I do not think you do.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, after all, the question of what is a disloyal man is not to be determined by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], my colleague, or myself. You may have the power to do it, but you will not be wise in exercising that power. The Constitution under its amendment gives authority to exclude a person for giving aid or comfort to the enemy. I do not think that that provision contemplated anything which Mr. Berger has done or sought to do. Because he may not have believed in the war—I do not know what his views are upon the subject—that is no reason why. In all history the men who stand out very largely in the parliaments of the world are those who opposed the wars in which their countries were engaged. Under the form of government, would anyone say in the House now that the war is still legally in existence; that we can not favor a peace? It is idle to talk such stuff.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair took out of my time, however, the time otherwise occupied.

The SPEAKER. If the Chair did that, the gentleman is recognized for another minute. The Chair was not aware of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I bow to the decision of the Chair.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE]. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, under the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who has immediately preceded me, if the people of the fifth district of Wisconsin chose to elect some one 19 years old and send him here, the House of Representatives must seat such person because he is chosen [applause], despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States expressly provides that a man must be, among other qualifications, 25 years of age.

Under the same argument, if the people of the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin shall choose a murderer or a felon in prison and elect him, no matter how odious he may be, he being their choice, the House of Representatives must accept him. [Applause.] And therefore, under the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], although, after four months of patient day and night hearings, making up a record of 3,000 printed pages, every word of which I and others of you have read, your committee of 11 ascertained and recommended, and this House, on November 10 last, by a vote of 311 to 1, judicially determined under your oaths that this man Berger, in the time of his country's woe, was a traitor to this country. [Applause.]

Nevertheless, because he has constituents un-American enough that they approve his infamy [applause], you must allow to sit in your company one who, at the time the Nation's destiny was at stake, struck in the interest of the Central Empires treacherously against the flag that protected him. [Applause.]

The question before us is simple. Fortunately for our ease of mind, if there be any gentleman present who needs a precedent rather than only a mind and a conscience and an Americanism for his guide, there is a precedent. In the seventies, from the State of South Carolina, a Republican man was elected Congressman to the House of Representatives, which was overwhelmingly Republican. He came here bearing a perfect certificate of election. He presented it. No objection was then known to exist against that man's qualifications. His name was B. F. Whittemore. He was sworn in. He sat as a Member. But during that session he was charged with having sold for money West Point and Annapolis appointments. The matter being brought to the attention of some Member of the House, a resolution of investigation of that charge was introduced, and a reference thereof made to the elections committee. Witnesses were summoned and the matter was prima facie proved. But, to avoid a vote upon the resolution of expulsion, Whittemore resigned.

During that same Congress the governor of the State of South Carolina called a special election. The people of that district had knowledge then—as the people of the fifth district of Wisconsin had knowledge at the time of the recent special election at which Berger was a candidate and was elected—that Whittemore was an unfit person to be elected to the Congress. But they chose to tell the Congress of the United States that they would send Mr. Whittemore back and thereby instruct the House of Representatives to seat him, despite his disqualification and unfitness, and thus compel the House to sit in the company of a man who resigned rather than be by the House judicially convicted of infamy. Upon Whittemore presenting his credentials, just as Berger has done this day, a resolution, in practically verbatim terms with that which my friend and colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has now tendered, was introduced, and a vote came up, and Whittemore was by that Congress, made up of a vast majority of his party, overwhelmingly rejected at the door. [Applause.]

There is your precedent, perfect. Stronger indeed is this man Berger's case than Whittemore's case as to the reason why you should now adopt this resolution of exclusion, because in Berger's case, during the last session of the present Congress, after four months of painstaking, patient hearings, in which such latitude as was perhaps never permitted in any committee of the House in recent Congresses was allowed for the bringing in of every tenet of the political party to which Berger belonged and the introduction of every writing and speech he made since he landed in America in 1868 down to this time, and every argument that could be made or thought of by able and ingenious counsel, our committee presented its report, and you, sitting as judges, by your vote in this present Congress, convicted Berger of disloyalty, and found judicially that he was guilty of the violation of the third section of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, and that automatically disqualifies him from sitting in the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGLE. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. If the issue is closed by an election, and that issue is concluded, what is the value of the provision of the Constitution that we shall be the sole judges of the eligibility or the right to membership in this body when that judgment can only be exercised on the man elected? [Applause.]

Mr. EAGLE. The gentleman's inquiry is an axiom.

Mr. REAVIS. Let me ask it in another way. Congress has the right to pass judgment on the eligibility of its Members?

Mr. EAGLE. Yes; under the Constitution, my friend.

Mr. REAVIS. Yes. We can only pass that judgment on the man elected by his constituents?

Mr. EAGLE. Yes. That is clearly the case.

Mr. REAVIS. Under the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if we are precluded by that election, how can we pass judgment? [Applause.]

Mr. EAGLE. That is unanswerable.

Mr. Speaker, the record of 3,000 pages in the Berger case in the last session of the present Congress is before you. It shows a beginning and a continuing purpose, plan, and conduct on the part of Berger from the time this country entered into war with Germany on April 6, 1917, until the armistice was signed, to discourage recruiting, to discourage enlistments in the Army and Navy, to cripple the efficiency of this country, to weaken the country's morale, to help Germany, and to injure America. You judicially ascertained, stated, voted, determined, forever settled that fact.

Having settled and determined that fact, it follows that you have judicially ascertained that under the third section of the fourteenth amendment, which provides that any man having previously taken the oath of office to support the Constitution

of the United States and having thereafter been guilty of disloyalty and treason, can not again sit in the House. Mr. Berger is ineligible, and you can not without violating your oath of office permit him now to sit here. [Applause.]

The House of Representatives will not thus be denying representation to the fifth district of Wisconsin—it will only thus inform them that the man they have elected and sent here is a traitor unworthy to sit in this House where loyal men sit who honor the Constitution and the institutions of the United States and the flag which to us is a sacred emblem. [Applause.]

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to yield the remaining 10 minutes allotted to the opponents of the resolution to Mr. Berger.

Mr. HICKS. I object.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to be permitted to yield 10 minutes to Mr. Berger. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. SNELL. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. DALLINGER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD].

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have never been accused of cowardice either in war or in peace. I am opposed to this resolution. I do not think we have any right as a representative body to decide that a duly elected candidate in a fair and free election shall not represent a certain constituency. I am opposed to the resolution on another ground. I do not believe in repressive legislation. Let me tell you how it operated in my own district. In 1918 we had three candidates for Congress, a Republican, a Democrat, and a Socialist. I happened to be the Democratic nominee. The Socialist candidate, Solon T. Klotz, polled 2,006 votes. After Eugene Debs was convicted and sent to the penitentiary, a year later, we had another election in that congressional district. Solon T. Klotz was a candidate for mayor. There were in that case three candidates on the ticket, and Klotz polled 15,242 votes. When you sent Eugene Debs to the penitentiary you made more socialists than all the soap-box agitators could make from Maine to California. I remember during our Civil War Clement L. Vallandigham, of Dayton, Ohio, made a speech denouncing the war. He was arrested by Gen. Burnside, in command of the Department of Cincinnati, 40 miles away from Dayton. He was tried by a court-martial and sentenced to be imprisoned in Fort Warren, near Boston, during the war. The record of the proceedings of that court-martial was sent to Abraham Lincoln through his Secretary of War, and he set aside the verdict of that court-martial. What was his ground for setting it aside? He said you could not convict men for ideas, only for overt acts. Abraham Lincoln did not have a single-track mind. He believed that ideas were the evangels of civilization. Then Vallandigham was sent through the lines to the South by Gen. Burnside. I was in Kentucky when he went through the lines. He went over to the Bahama Islands on a Confederate cruiser, and from there to Canada. In 1863—the same year—he ran for governor of Ohio from Canada. He polled a very large vote by citizens at home, but the soldier vote beat him by over 90,000 votes.

Free speech and a free press are sacredly guarded and guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. This provision was fully debated by the great statesmen of the Constitutional Convention before adoption. Thomas Jefferson, the father of real democracy, said in defense of this vital guaranty in the Constitution that error is not dangerous where truth is free to combat it. During the entire four years' war, 1861 to 1865, the fiercest and most desperate the world had ever witnessed, no citizen of the Republic was sent to the penitentiary on account of his ideas or principles or convictions.

We read daily of the arrest of unruly citizens who, it is alleged, are seeking to overthrow the Government. I do not for one moment believe it is in the power of any class of agitators to overthrow this Government. I have full faith in the patriotism, the love of country, and the love of home of a vast majority to scotch in its inception any move in that direction. But Abraham Lincoln, the patriot saint of real democracy, in a speech made on the floor of this historic Chamber January 12, 1848, said on this question:

Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing Government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable and sacred right, a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it.

In the same speech Lincoln denounced our war with Mexico as an unjust war in the most sweeping and denunciatory language. I quote from Lincoln:

I more than suspect already that he—President Polk—is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels the blood of Abel is crying to heaven against him; that he ordered Gen. Taylor into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement purposely to bring on a war; that originally having some strong motive—what I will not stop to give my opinion concerning—to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory—that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood; that serpent's eye that charms to destroy—he plunged into it, and has swept on and on till, disappointed in his calculation of the ease with which Mexico might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where.

Lincoln charged President Polk with carrying the country into an unjustifiable and unjust war. Of course, we must all concede that were Lincoln on earth to-day with such an utterance he would now be serving a sentence in the penitentiary along with Eugene Debs.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not believe in Victor Berger's principles. I believe, and have so acted throughout this whole World War, that it is the patriotic and imperative duty to support the Government when the war is on. I voted for every measure to promote and carry on the war after the declaration of war. I have full faith in the patriotism, courage, and fidelity of the American people, and I do not believe that all the wild, soap-box orators from Maine to California can destroy or even impair the vitality or sovereignty of this great free Government. I believe with Jefferson and Lincoln that error is not dangerous when truth is left free to combat it. [Applause.]

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. Fifteen minutes have been used on each side.

Mr. DALLINGER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA]. [Applause.]

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I can not accept the logic of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that by refusing to seat Victor Berger the House will disfranchise those who voted for him. [Applause.]

The Constitution of the United States provides what the qualifications of Members of this House must be. The disqualification and ineligibility of Berger was known to every voter of his district. It was proclaimed through the press, from the public platform, from the billboards, through the mail, and through every means of advertising and every agency of knowledge communication. Everyone voting in that election knew what the issue was. And yet, with a full knowledge of Berger's disqualification and a keen appreciation of the results of that disqualification, they defiantly and contumaciously cast their votes for Victor Berger. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin declared that a vote cast for a candidate known to be disqualified is null and void. When they cast their votes for Victor Berger, whom they knew to be ineligible, they were aware of the fact that their votes were null and void. They, therefore, disfranchised themselves by their voluntary and defiant action. [Applause.]

Are we going to listen to the voice of those who defied the Constitution and held in scorn and contempt the laws of the land? Are we going to place a premium on defiance of law and order? Are we to give more weight to the rebellious and defiant action of those who by their votes approved Berger's seditious statements and treacherous conduct than we are to the judgment and decrees of the supreme court of a sovereign State?

The precedent cited by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] disposes of the contention that the proposed action of the House is unprecedented. Even if there was no precedent for the action contemplated by the pending resolution, surely the present is a most opportune time and the facts in this case most compelling to create a precedent. [Applause.]

This House, on the 10th day of November last, pronounced its solemn judgment of Berger's disqualification and ineligibility. The Elections Committee, after a full, exhaustive, and deliberative hearing, found Victor Berger guilty of giving aid and comfort to the enemy of the United States. Courageously and with a due regard for the oath which every Member of this House took to support the Constitution of the United States, this House sustained the findings of that committee and excluded Berger from membership. Is Berger less guilty to-day than he was on November 10?

Because this House patriotically and faithfully upheld the organic law of the land and the honor of this House, Victor Berger brands the Members of this body as corrupt and servile agents of the capitalists. The spectacle of November 10 last is still clear in every Member's mind's eye. Accorded the privilege of this floor, he heaped abuse upon organized government and constituted authority; he hurled defiance at law and order and insulted the membership of this House. To what extremes

must the Constitution be reviled and this House insulted before we call a halt? Berger knew when he again became a candidate that he could not be seated in this House. He only added insult to the injury which he has done to the country. By his action he has thrown down the gauntlet to this House. In the name of the heroes living, in the name of that splendid band of militant Americans who are members of the American Legion and whom Berger with scornful hate calls "the cat's-paws of the capitalists," in the name of the martyred dead who sleep in the fields of Flanders and France we will accept that challenge. [Applause.]

Nothing has transpired between the day that Berger was excluded and this day that would warrant any modification or reversal of the judgment of this body. His conduct and his utterances since that day have but furnished additional evidence that fortifies and strengthens the verdict of this House. Since his expulsion he has declared on every public occasion that he would repeat his treasonable statements and actions, only he would make them "much stronger."

Since his expulsion he has but grown more rebellious and more defiant of governmental authority. He publicly and repeatedly declared that "if the fifth congressional district of Wisconsin elected a horse thief or a polygamist as its representative," it was of no concern to this House, and that this body would be compelled to seat such an elected representative. That is Victor Berger's conception of representative government. But these declarations are in harmony with his perverted philosophy. He has never said one commendable thing about this land of freedom and opportunity. He never saw anything noble in American institutions and in American ideals. He prates about constitutional rights and in the same breath condemns and reviles the Constitution as "a scrap of paper."

Who ever heard of a man duly convicted after a full and fair hearing, going about the country and condemning and reviling the tribunal that passed the judgment of conviction, and then appearing before that same tribunal which he vilified, and obtained another hearing of his case? To grant another hearing to this man would be to impugn the patriotism and question the judgment of this House, so solemnly pronounced in this case on November 10 last. To seat this man would be to condone and approve his treasonable conduct and seditious declarations; it would mean that this House has compromised with disloyalty and sedition. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. GRIFFIN had leave to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT].

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I was the only Member who voted to seat Mr. Berger when this matter was up before, and my views are already in the Record. I desire to say now that I am more firmly convinced than ever that Mr. Berger is entitled to his seat. It seems to me highly unfair to jump on Mr. Berger, who is here helpless and alone. He is called a traitor to his face and he is denied the opportunity to speak in his own defense. Judge Landis, who decided judicially that he was not prejudiced against Mr. Berger, is reported by the Chicago Tribune to have said that he was sorry the law did not permit him to order Victor Berger stood against a wall and shot.

Mr. Berger, in my judgment, is a high-minded and honorable gentleman. [Laughter.] You may laugh and scoff, gentlemen, but I know Victor Berger. No man can devote his whole life and fortune to the great cause of endeavoring to better the condition of the toiling millions, stand by his principles like a rock of Gibraltar, regardless of personal consequences, without being morally great. I do not agree with Mr. Berger politically, I do not agree with his economic theories, but I hope that I am big enough to recognize the purity of his character and motives.

Victor Berger's name will stand in the future as that of a martyr to a great cause—the rights of free speech, free press, and representative government. History has always justified such men and history will justify Victor Berger. The people of his district, who know him best, have already justified him. They have spoken in no uncertain tones, and the old maxim is that the voice of the people is the supreme law. You may say that Victor Berger is a traitor, but if you do, you have got to say that there are 25,000 traitors in the fifth district of Wisconsin.

A MEMBER. There are.

Mr. VOIGT. There are not. The people of the fifth district of Wisconsin are just as loyal and just as patriotic as the people of any district in this country. [Applause.] They may have different views from the people in other districts as to what constitutes patriotism in a given situation, and they are entitled to their views. You can look up the war activities of that dis-

trict and you will find less law-breaking than in probably 99 per cent of the districts of the country. You will find that they responded to every call of the Government.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. According to that theory, if that is the test to be applied, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Judas Iscariot was treasurer of the Twelve Apostles up to the time he committed the one offense. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. VOIGT. That was a long time ago. [Laughter.] Mr. Berger, as I understand it, is what is known as a mild socialist. [Laughter.] You may laugh again and laugh some more. Mr. Berger is called by the socialists of this country a mild socialist, no matter what you may think about it. The socialists of this country know more about socialism than the Members of this House. Mr. Berger was threatened with ejection and abused at a convention of the Socialist Party in Chicago last September because he would not stand for any radical doctrines. The men who opposed him there, and who withdrew to form a party of their own, knew what Victor Berger stood for.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. No; I can not yield. Mr. Berger has at no time advocated a violation of law. It is charged here that he stands for revolution. Why, gentlemen, when Mr. Berger talks about revolution he means a peaceable, economic revolution; he does not refer to force. You must give Mr. Berger credit for having time and again in his paper, The Milwaukee Leader, advocated compliance with the law. You evidently do not give him credit for that, but it is a fact that he has said time and again that any changes, economically or politically, which he advocates must be brought about peaceably, through the ballot box.

The Constitution of this country guarantees Mr. Berger the right of free speech. If that means anything it means that he should have the right to explain his position on the economic and political questions facing the people of this country. It is said that he is opposed to war. I grant him the right to be opposed to war, as much as I grant the right to a man to favor war. If a man does not believe in war he has the absolute right to express his views. I am not afraid that this country is going to the dogs because Mr. Berger or any other man expresses his opinions. Not only is he entitled to be heard, but the people are entitled to hear him. If you are going to bottle up every man who has something to say which is out of harmony with regular doctrine, the intellectual world must come to a standstill. I have implicit faith in the good sense of the American people. If they find anything good in Mr. Berger's message they have a right to accept it; if not they will reject it.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOIGT. No; I can not yield. Let me say in conclusion you are not only doing an injustice in denying Mr. Berger a seat in this House, but you are playing exceedingly bad politics. You are making a million or two socialist votes by your action. I prophesy that the next national election will show the folly of your course in evicting Mr. Berger from this House. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman's objection is characteristic of most of the House at present.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I do not know how many people object to Mr. Berger being heard.

Mr. BLANTON. I do, and I am going to continue to object.

Mr. SISSON. I want to ask if it would be in order to make a motion to give Mr. Berger an opportunity to be heard, say, for 30 or 40 minutes?

The SPEAKER. He can be allowed time only by unanimous consent, not being a Member of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. And I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit another parliamentary inquiry. Does Mr. Berger occupy the same position and status as a man would who is having a contest over his election?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SISSON. I want to be heard upon the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Would he have the right—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not stated any point of order.

Mr. SISSON. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Berger is entitled to be heard. I do not believe that this

House will put itself in the attitude before the country of not giving a man an opportunity to be heard, however anxious every Member of the House might be to come to a vote.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman cite any precedent for a person who is not a Member of the House being heard, except by the unanimous consent of the House?

Mr. SISSON. I am insisting that by motion—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman cite any precedent?

Mr. SISSON. I am not prepared to cite a precedent now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may take his time to look up a precedent, and if he can find one the Chair will be very glad to hear him. In the absence of a precedent, the Chair thinks that a person not a Member can only speak by unanimous consent.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a moment. The only argument that has been made on behalf of Mr. Berger's claim to a seat in the House is that an election having been held in the fifth district of Wisconsin, and it having been claimed that Mr. Berger received a majority of the votes cast at that election, that fact is not only very persuasive but practically compels favorable action on the part of the House in the matter of seating him. Unfortunately for the gentlemen who make that argument and for the argument it runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, the Constitution of the United States. It runs counter to the oath that we have taken to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution limits those who are eligible to the honor of a seat in this House. It provides that they must be citizens, that they must be above a certain age, and that they must possess certain qualifications. Section 3 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution provides:

SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress or as an officer of the United States or as a member of any State legislature or as an executive or judicial officer of any State to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof.

This House, through one of its committees, has heretofore examined the record of Mr. Berger. That record was placed before the House. That record as placed before the House and the arguments made in support of it satisfied every Member of this House then present, save one, that Victor Berger had been guilty of a violation of a law of the Union, that he had given aid and comfort to the enemies of the country, and that therefore he was not eligible to a seat in this House. It follows, therefore, that notwithstanding what any people may have since done in his behalf, in an election or elsewhere, under the Constitution of the United States, under our oath to support that Constitution, in view of and consistent with the action we have heretofore taken, we can not seat him as a Member of this body. [Applause.]

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I simply ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in bringing this debate to a close, I simply want to cite one other illustration of the utter fallacy of the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in regard to the right of a constituency to choose anyone they see fit and to have him seated by this House. Let us suppose that Mr. Berger was still an Austrian subject. According to the logic of the gentleman from Illinois, we would have to seat him, because the people of that district chose to elect him. The Constitution, however, expressly provides that no person shall be a Member of this House who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years, or who has not been a citizen for seven years, or—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I can not yield.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman ought not to falsify my statements.

Mr. DALLINGER. Who was not a resident of the State at the time of his election, and the Constitution also says, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has again pointed out, that no person who has previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress to support the Constitution of the United States, which Mr. Berger did in 1911, and who subsequently gave aid and comfort to its enemies, shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress. This prohibition is in the Constitution, to support which every Member of this House has

taken a solemn oath. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why any Member should change his vote. Mr. Berger is just as much unfit and ineligible to membership in this House to-day as he was on November 10, and I trust that the Members of this House will be true to their oaths of office and vote for the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DALLINGER. And on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 330, nays 6, answered "present" 1, not voting 91, as follows:

YEAS—330.

Ackerman	Eagle	Lanham	Reber
Almon	Echols	Lankford	Reed, W. Va.
Anderson	Edmonds	Larsen	Ricketts
Andrews, Nebr.	Elliott	Layton	Riddick
Anthony	Ellsworth	Lazaro	Robison, Ky.
Ashbrook	Elston	Lea, Calif.	Rogers
Ayres	Emerson	Lee, Ga.	Romjue
Babka	Esch	Lehlbach	Rose
Baer	Evans, Nebr.	Leshner	Rowe
Bankhead	Evans, Nev.	Linthicum	Rubey
Barbour	Fairfield	Little	Rucker
Barkley	Ferris	Loneragan	Sanders, N. Y.
Bee	Fields	Longworth	Sanford
Begg	Fisher	Luce	Scott
Benham	Flood	Lufkin	Sears
Black	Focht	Luhning	Sells
Bland, Ind.	Fordney	McAndrews	Shreve
Bland, Va.	Foster	McArthur	Sinclair
Blanton	Frear	McClintic	Sinnot
Boies	Freeman	McCulloch	Small
Bowers	French	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Box	Fuller, Ill.	McGlennon	Smith, Mich.
Brand	Gallivan	McKenzie	Smithwick
Briggs	Gard	McKiniry	Snell
Brinson	Garland	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stegall
Brooks, Ill.	Garner	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stedman
Brown	Glynn	MacCrate	Steenerson
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	MacGregor	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Goodwin, Ark.	Madden	Stephens, Ohio
Burdick	Goodykoontz	Magge	Stevenson
Burroughs	Gould	Maber	Stiness
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Major	Stoll
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	Mann, S. C.	Strong, Kans.
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Vt.	Mansfield	Strong, Pa.
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Mapes	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Martin	Summers, Tex.
Cannon	Hamilton	Mays	Sweet
Cantrill	Hardy, Tex.	Mead	Swope
Caraway	Hastings	Merritt	Tague
Carss	Haugen	Michener	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Hawley	Miller	Taylor, Tenn.
Casey	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Temple
Chindblom	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Thomas
Christopherson	Heflin	Mondell	Tillman
Clark, Fla.	Hernandez	Montague	Tilson
Clark, Mo.	Hersey	Mooney	Timberlake
Classon	Hickey	Moore, Ohio	Tincher
Cleary	Hicks	Moore, Va.	Tinkham
Coady	Hoch	Morgan	Towner
Cole	Hoe	Mudd	Treadway
Collier	Hoyer	Murphy	Upshaw
Connally	Holland	Neely	Vaile
Cooper	Houghton	Nelson, Mo.	Vare
Copley	Howard	Nelson, Wis.	Venable
Costello	Hudspeth	Newton, Minn.	Vestal
Crago	Hullings	Newton, Mo.	Vinson
Cramton	Hull, Iowa	Nolan	Volstead
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell	Walsh
Currie, Mich.	Humphreys	Ogden	Walters
Curry, Calif.	Husted	Oldfield	Ward
Dale	Hutchinson	Oliver	Wason
Dallinger	Igoe	Olney	Watkins
Darrow	Jacoway	Osborne	Watson
Davey	James	Overstreet	Weaver
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Padgett	Webster
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Welling
Dempsey	Jones, Tex.	Park	Whaley
Denson	Juul	Parker	Wheeler
Dent	Kahn	Parrish	White, Kans.
Dewalt	Kearns	Phelan	White, Me.
Dickinson, Mo.	Keller	Porter	Williams
Dickinson, Iowa	Kelley, Mich.	Pou	Wilson, Ill.
Dominick	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	Wilson, Pa.
Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Quin	Wingo
Doremus	Kettner	Radcliffe	Winslow
Doughton	Kiess	Ratney, Ala.	Wise
Dowell	Kincheloe	Raney, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Drane	King	Raker	Yates
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Ramsey	Young, N. Dak.
Dunn	Kitchin	Ramseyer	Young, Tex.
Dupré	Klecza	Randall, Calif.	Zihlman
Dyer	Knutson	Randall, Wis.	
Eagan	Kraus	Reavis	
	Lampert		

NAYS—6.

Griffin	Mann, Ill.	Sisson	Voigt
Harrell	Sherwood		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Sabath

NOT VOTING—91.

Andrews, Md.	Ganly	McDuffie	Rouse
Aswell	Garrett	McKeown	Rowan
Bacharach	Goldfogle	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.
Bell	Good	McLane	Sanders, La.
Benson	Goodall	McPherson	Saunders, Va.
Blackmon	Graham, Ill.	Mason	Schall
Bland, Mo.	Greene, Mass.	Moon	Scully
Booher	Hamill	Moore, Ind.	Siegel
Britten	Hardy, Colo.	Morin	Sims
Brooks, Pa.	Harrison	Mott	Slomp
Browning	Hersman	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, Ill.
Burke	Hill	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Huddleston	O'Connor	Snyder
Candler	Ireland	Pell	Steele
Carew	Jeffers	Peters	Sullivan
Crowther	Johnson, Ky.	Platt	Taylor, Ark.
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Rainey, J. W.	Thompson
Doelling	Johnson, Wash.	Rayburn	Welty
Evans, Mont.	Johnston, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, La.
Fess	Kendall	Rhodes	Woods, Va.
Fuller, Mass.	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan	Woodyard
Gallagher	Kreider	Robinson, N. C.	Wright
Gandy	Langley	Rodenberg	

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I just came out of a sick bed and I was entering the Hall when my name was called—

The SPEAKER. The Chair must ask the gentleman if he was present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. BLACKMON. I desire to vote "aye," but I had just walked in the Hall when my name was called, and then the next name—

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman hear it called?

Mr. BLACKMON. I just came in the door and it was too late to answer, but I was in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman hear his name called?

Mr. BLACKMON. Yes, sir; I just walked in the door, but I did not have an opportunity to cast my vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hardly thinks the gentleman qualifies. The question is that the gentleman must answer affirmatively if he was present and listening when his name was called.

Mr. BLACKMON. I was not in time to vote. I was present and perhaps I do not qualify.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was not in time to vote—

Mr. BLACKMON. My name was called as I came in the door, and the next name—

The SPEAKER. The Chair fears the gentleman is not entitled to vote.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman suggests that he came in the door from the lobby and heard his name called, but he could not answer in time.

The SPEAKER. Why could not he answer? The Chair could not hear why he could not answer.

Mr. GALLIVAN. He says the next name was called following his. I do not think the Chair heard that. The next name after his was called.

Mr. BLACKMON. I could not afford to shout my name when I was coming in the door.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If he did not answer then, he can not answer now.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of little importance. I did not care to pull off a Wild West stunt out there at the door, and so I do not think I am qualified. It is all right.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The principal question is if a man is here in the House and refused to answer when his name was called twice, can he then come up and vote?

Mr. BLACKMON. I would have voted "yea" had I been in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the gentleman qualifies.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from New Jersey, Mr. BACHARACH and Mr. BROWNING, are unavoidably absent. They request me to say that if they were present they would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, Mr. CALDWELL, and that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by my colleague, Mr. STEELE, who is unavoidably absent on account of illness in his family, to say that if he were here he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. VOIGT, now have leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr.

VOIGT, may have leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman could print the speech of Mr. Berger under it, and I object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HARRISON, is absent on account of illness. I am authorized to say that if he were here he would vote "yea" on the resolution which has just been adopted.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. RHODES, who is ill and was unable to be here yesterday or to-day, may be excused, and to state that if he were here he would have voted for the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. RHODES, may be excused from attendance on yesterday and to-day on account of illness. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan, is detained in Detroit on account of illness, and I am authorized to say that if he were present he would have voted in the affirmative on this resolution.

Mr. VOIGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks on the Berger matter, and to say that if leave is granted I shall extend only my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

On motion of Mr. DALLINGER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have leave to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11578, the Post Office appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the committee resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11578, the Post Office appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11578, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11578) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee adjourned last evening the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] had consumed 53 minutes. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON] has 90 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama has asked me to take charge of the time in his temporary absence, and I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not detain you long. The postal employees have made the handling of the mails the one activity of the Government that all will concede has rivaled any achievement of private business. Yet I think the postal employees are the worst paid of any employees of the Government. I am speaking now only of the conditions that exist in my own section of the country, because I am not familiar with them in other sections. Almost every day brings to the department the resignation of a postmaster or a rural carrier or a city letter carrier from my district; and to show you how little competition there is for these places, I have now upon my desk three or four cases of long-established post offices where the department is unable

to procure a postmaster at all. Recently it appeared that an office paying between \$800 and \$1,000 would have to be abolished because there was nobody who would accept the position. This is the seventh year in which I have served as a Member of Congress, and in all that time there has not been in my district a single contest for the appointment of a rural carrier. There has never been more than one man wanting the same job, and nearly every mail brings a resignation. The work is hard, the roads are not overly good, and therefore at the present rate of compensation it is almost impossible to keep carriers at all.

Going back again to fourth-class postmasters, it is almost impossible in some communities to get anyone to serve. Under the present arrangement, when they must pay rent and for light and fuel and are allowed practically nothing for clerk hire, it is almost, if not quite, impossible to have some communities served at all, and many men are now serving as postmasters who want to quit if somebody can be found to take their places. This is especially true of some of the communities where fourth-class post offices are compelled to act as central accounting offices. Men handling more funds and being responsible for more supplies of money value than the cashier of an ordinary bank are making net salaries sometimes of less than \$40 a month. We can not maintain the service at its present high standard unless some change is made.

In my particular section of the State we have a very few star-route carriers, but in other sections of the State men have gone into bankruptcy trying to fulfill contracts entered into with the Government when conditions were wholly different. I had a letter yesterday from a man who has a contract to carry the mail. He has lived up to it so far, but in order to do that at all he has been compelled to mortgage the house in which he lives to raise a sufficient fund to fulfill the contract which he entered into with the Government.

This class of postal employees—the fourth-class postmasters, the central accounting offices, and rural carriers, and the star-route carriers—ought to be taken care of more generously than they are in this bill, or have been in the past. Ordinarily I am not an advocate of raising everybody's salary. I have not been at all filled with that enthusiasm over raising the salaries of generals of the Army or admirals of the Navy that so agitated some Members on the floor of the House. I have not been in sympathy with the propaganda that if you do not raise the pay of these high Army officers immediately they will resign and that the service would become demoralized. I think the man who owes everything to his country for his education and then threatens to quit unless you raise his pay immediately might quit the service for the benefit of the service. [Laughter.]

But I do know that these postal employees who labor under these disadvantages I have been telling you about are entitled to some kind of an increase.

Take a rural carrier who goes out of my town, who has 29 and some odd miles of muddy roads to travel six days in the week and has to pay for the upkeep of his team and conveyance as all do. There is not a man living that would take that contract if it were not for the fact that it is a Government contract; but because he is willing to serve his Government he ought not to be penalized, he ought to be paid a living wage. His is not an isolated case; all or nearly all are similarly situated. When these sections of the bill are reached, dealing with this class of employees, I hope that something may be done that will make their services rendered to the Government not performed at an actual loss. They are entitled to live and rear their families in comfort.

If I am not mistaken, and I do not believe I am, there is not a rural carrier serving in my State now under present conditions whose salary is not more than half consumed by the cost of the equipage with which he serves the Government. It strikes me that it is as unanswerable to require him to furnish a buggy and a horse or two horses or a car in order to deliver the mail on a rural route as it would be to require the postal clerk to own the car that transports the mail on the railroad. The rural carrier is serving the public, and he ought to have the equipment with which he serves the public furnished him. I hope some provision will be made to take care of that situation in the bill.

I have often heretofore called attention to the inadequate pay of postal employees. I am pleased to note from year to year some advances in pay have been granted. May we not now cease to discharge this debt we owe them on the installment plan. Let us pay it at once by giving to all these patriotic and loyal postal employees a living wage. They deserve it; we should do it.

The reason for not doing full justice to them in this measure is that we wait on the joint committee's report. We know what that committee ought to report. Why not anticipate it

and bring relief to these long-suffering employees now? For one I am in favor of doing it. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, we have now before the Sixty-sixth Congress for consideration the second regular supply measure to take care of the needs of our Government. Our great majority party on the floor of the House having charge of this great legislation has present exactly 13 Members.

Mr. PAIGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not now. If the gentleman wants to correct me I will yield.

Mr. PAIGE. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his party has 10 Members present and 2 boys. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and of the 10, 6 are Texans, and there is also the gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from New York. But there are exactly 13 majority Members present of the great party which has made so many promises to the people about taking care of the interests of the people, now on the floor for the consideration of the second great supply bill. The people are finding out that you are not here, just like they will find out that there are 13 of the majority here now.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I can not yield now. Yes; I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. BLACK. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not his intention to go to his office as soon as he gets through with his speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I will answer specifically that it is not.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman said that he wanted to occupy his time now because he wanted to go to his office.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I said I wanted to fill two engagements with two constituents.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; but I understood that was to be in the gentleman's office.

Mr. BLANTON. No; because my constituents are waiting for me out in the hall.

Mr. BLACK. Well, with that modification, it is all right.

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague knows that I am here all the time when business is being transacted, except when my constituents call me out, and then I am out only a few minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield now. I want to state what I intended to say. The people of this country are not going to stand for this kind of representation by the Republican Party, and if you Republican colleagues of mine expect to remain in charge of the business of this country you had better stay here and take care of the business, because the people will find out that you are not here.

Now, I want to say that the same emergency conditions that exist in the district of my colleague [Mr. PARRISH] exist in mine. One of the greatest oil fields in the United States is in my district and the district of my colleague [Mr. PARRISH]. What is known as the Big Ranger oil fields is in my district. There is one well there which has flowed as much as 12,600 barrels a day in my district. For over six months I have been calling the attention of the House to the abnormal conditions that exist there calling for immediate remedial legislation. I called the attention of my colleague [Mr. BLACK], who is a member of the Post Office Committee, to that fact. He promised me that when the bill was brought in he was going to take care of these conditions, and I am glad to say that he has taken care of them, and I think after the passage of this bill these good people who have suffered so many inconveniences, some having had their mail sent to another place 30 miles distant in order to get it, will no longer have to do so.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. I hope when the gentleman goes out into the hall to consult with his constituents he will take note of the large number of Republicans out there also consulting with their constituents.

Mr. BLANTON. Out in the hall?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know how many are out there now?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, I will leave that for the gentleman to observe when he goes out.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell you where they are, a great many of them—no; I will not tell the gentleman, because it might be humiliating.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I have a few remarks that I desire to make upon this bill.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a short question?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not refuse to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROSE. I would like to know whether or not the gentleman ever noticed conditions two years ago like those that he notices to-day?

Mr. BLANTON. And that was one of the reasons that put us out of power, because the gentleman will remember that every time this House then found only a few Democrats here in charge of the business the distinguished present Chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], rose in his place and publicly called attention to the fact. It was the people of the country who administered punishment to us for not staying here and taking care of the business of the people, and they are going to do the same to you Republicans in the next election, because they have found out that you do just like everyone else. You Republicans do not stay here and take care of the business of the people after they have reposed their confidence in you.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does not the gentleman think that the people, after having seen those who represent them in Congress on the Republican side, will be better pleased if they stay away? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, they want them here.

Mr. CARAWAY. For what purpose?

Mr. BLANTON. They have voted to send them here, to stay here and attend to business, and they expect them to do so.

Mr. CARAWAY. But when they find out that they have made a mistake, does the gentleman not think they will be willing to have them stay away?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; if they find they have made a mistake. They swap horses themselves once in a while—the Democrats do.

Mr. CARAWAY. But I am talking about the gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the Republicans swap horses. They change about frequently. I want to say here that I believe the only safeguard on God's green earth to the people of this country is the fact that every two years they have the right to change their Representatives. It is their only safeguard, and they are not tied to us for six years. Every two years they have the right to change, and if you think the people are ever going to be green enough to change that law you are mistaken. That is one right that they are going to hold to and to hold to carefully.

But coming back to this bill, I am glad that it provides for these emergency cases. An oil town with 10,000 people in it needs its mail just like people in any other town of 10,000, and to be compelled to have a fourth-class postmaster in a town of that kind is ridiculous, because no one could be found anywhere in the United States who would assume the responsibility.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. How long have these conditions existed in Texas—these developments?

Mr. BLANTON. A little over a year. These emergencies have been growing.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. PARRISH says a year and a half.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean these emergency cases. They have existed for the past year, where towns such as he has mentioned have grown up.

Mr. STEENERSON. He says a year and a half.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the oil has been there for a year and a half, but the crowded towns have not been there such as he mentioned.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Under the existing law the Postmaster General can take care of them if such conditions exist for a year, and we have cut that down to three months. The condition has existed for a year, the gentleman says. Has the Postmaster General done anything?

Mr. BLANTON. Where the four quarters have shown the required receipts; yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. He has?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make any lengthy speech on this bill, because there are really no points of controversy in the committee. I hardly think there will be

any contest on the items of appropriation. Also I think there is a general agreement on the few items of legislation that are contained in the bill. Really the most important item of legislation in the bill is section 2, which provides that the temporary salary increases of February, 1919, and November, 1919, shall be continued for the next fiscal year. We are all, of course, familiar with the fact that we now have a postal commission composed of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate, that is investigating the whole question of postal salaries, with a view of recommending legislation, looking to a permanent readjustment of the pay of postmasters, postal clerks, rural carriers, letter carriers, railway mail clerks, and all the other postal employees.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman tell the House just how soon that commission is expected to report?

Mr. BLACK. I will say to my colleague from Texas I do not have the honor of being a member of the commission, but it is my impression and understanding that the commission will probably report by the 1st of March. They are still carrying on some investigations, and are compiling the questionnaires and the data that they have gathered, with a view of making recommendations to Congress, and that will probably be not later than the 1st of March.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman know whether the committee contemplates taking up those recommendations independent of any action in this bill, supplementing such action as may be taken by the House on this bill?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; that is the contemplation. It is contemplated that this commission will recommend legislation. Of course, that legislation will have to take its turn in the House. It is uncertain just when it will be taken up, but it is very probable that it will be taken up in the House before the 1st of July.

But it is not at all certain it will be enacted and put into law before the 1st of July, and therefore the committee thought it would be wise to put into this bill the assurance that the temporary increases would be continued, so that the postal employees might not rest uneasy on that score and so that it might not go to the country that the Post Office appropriation bill had passed the House without containing the present salary level. So that was the real reason for putting these temporary provisions into the bill at this time. Now, we hear a good deal said in the magazines and papers at the present time about budget legislation. We have already passed a budget bill in the House, and I dare say that the Senate will also pass a bill on that subject, and a law of that kind will therefore be enacted during the present session, and I hope that a great many economies will result from the passage of the law and that it will meet the full expectation of its advocates; but, as to the Postal Service, I doubt if it works any substantial economy, because, be it said to the credit of our able Postmaster General and his assistants, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads rarely finds it necessary to revise downward any estimate that the Post Office Department makes. Of course, a great deal of that is due to the long and settled organization of the department, business machinery which it has already built up, but it is no exaggeration to say that a great deal of the credit is due to Postmaster General Burleson and the very able men with whom he has surrounded himself. Now, in the case of this bill which we are now considering the estimates of the department were based on the basic salaries, as under the law they should have been, and the total amount of the estimates submitted to the committee was, in round numbers, I believe, about \$390,000,000. The present bill carries \$461,000,000, or a difference of about \$70,000,000 over the department estimates. Now, the reason for that is, as I have stated, the committee has decided to continue these temporary salary increases, and they will amount to about \$70,000,000 for the next fiscal year. I think from every consideration that the postal employees merit a continuance of these increases. From any standard we may view the matter they are entitled to have it done. Now, one of the criticisms that we hear quite frequently as to our present industrial conditions is that the productive value of labor has gone down—that labor does not produce what it used to do. Well, there is one thing we can definitely say and confidently assert, and that is that the productive value of the labor of postal employees has been fully maintained throughout the war. The chairman of the committee [Mr. STEENERSON] yesterday in his very comprehensive statement made mention of the fact that in the months of September, October, and November, 1919, there was an increase of 25 per cent in the postal revenues over the corresponding months of 1918, excluding the war-revenue portion of the law. Now, what does that mean? Of course, it does not necessarily

mean that the amount of the mail as to weight has increased 25 per cent, because first-class mail matter is of lighter weight than second-class, and probably second-class matter lighter than some fourth-class matter, but it does mean that the volume of the mail has grown very substantially and in a greater proportion than the increase in the number of postal employees, and therefore the only fair deduction that you can make is that the postal employees are performing a larger amount of labor than formerly. In other words, they have responded splendidly to the needs of the situation.

Now, it is a sound rule and one that will undoubtedly work a solution of a great many of our economic ills that with increased production we will have better standards of living. That is to say, there must be a larger production. Of course, you can arbitrarily increase the salary of one class of employees; that is, you can increase one class much greater than similar classes, and you might by that method raise the standard of living of that particular class of employees, but the mass of the people, the great mass of the world's population, can only have a better standard of living by increasing the production of the world. There can be no controversy as to that proposition. Therefore I say these postal employees merit and deserve consideration at the hands of Congress, because notwithstanding the distracting things that have taken place during the war, notwithstanding the unrest of the country—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to remind the gentleman from Texas that he has used 10 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. I will use five minutes more, if the Chair will permit. I say, notwithstanding the unrest and the propaganda and distracting things which have taken place, the fact remains that the postal employees, something like 300,000 of them, have gone on in the face of those disconcerting circumstances and have handled a larger volume of mail, much larger than they handled before the war, and have handled it very efficiently. Now, that is one reason why these salaries are fully justified. Another reason is that even if you grant that labor has remained upon the same basis of production, if a man is working the same number of hours as he did in 1914 and is producing no more nor no less, he would undoubtedly be entitled to a wage increase because of economic conditions which exist. What is the situation that faces us? By reason of the practical doubling of the circulating medium of the country, what do we find? We find the man who owned a piece of property—a house and lot, we will say—in 1914, then worth \$3,000, notwithstanding he may not have added anything at all in the way of improvements on his property since then—maybe he has not painted it or has not repapered it or anything of that kind—finds that he owns a place now worth \$6,000. We find that the man owning a horse worth \$150 in 1914 owns a horse now worth \$300.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. In a moment. We find the man who owned a 100-acre farm, for instance, in my section of Texas, or in your section of Kansas, or in yours of Maryland, or in the State of New York—a man who owned a hundred acres of land, we will say, that was worth \$10,000, or \$100 an acre, in 1914, notwithstanding the soil may not now be as fertile, notwithstanding it may have had to yield crops that may have decreased its fertility, we find a farm worth \$20,000 by reason of these changed conditions. Now I will yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I was going to ask the gentleman whether he observed the statement in the papers a few days ago from one of the departments that the dollar to-day was only worth 47 cents in comparison with six years ago?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; and I think that is about right. Perhaps the situation is not that bad, but certainly there has been a great decline in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Now, the point I am making is this, that every man who is fortunate enough to own a commodity or a piece of property has seen the value of that doubled by the workings of economic law. Of course, if he owns a bond or some definite evidence of indebtedness, it has not increased. But the laboring man, so far as his labor is concerned, finds he has the same productive capacity as before, and certainly not double what it was before, therefore the only way he can meet this situation is to have his wages increased so as to meet this rise in value.

Now, a good many of us thought—I admit I was one who thought it—that when the war closed this abnormal situation would go back to normal or nearly so. But I have become convinced that the only way we could bring prices of commodities and property back to normal would be by a radical method of deflation of the currency, and that would absolutely paralyze the business of the country. It can not possibly be done. And therefore the real problem of statesmanship at this time, and the real problem that faces the business of the country, is to see to it that wherever employees have not received a comparable increase of wages to the increased cost of living, that they do

receive it. That is the only fair and the only wise thing to do. And so, of course, under these circumstances, the least that we can do is to continue these temporary increases until the Postal Commission makes its report. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I really do not think it is necessary to use 30 minutes in discussing this bill. Everybody seems to be for every item in it, and there is not much satisfaction in discussing anything on which everybody is agreed. There is real fun in making a speech when we are trying to convince everybody else that they are wrong. Since everybody is right on this question, anything I may say can not have very much interest for those who are here.

But I wish to say one thing, and that is that the marvelous growth of the Post Office Department in the last year or two is such that no matter how much vision those who are in control may have, it seems almost impossible to keep pace with the facilities necessary to conduct the business as it ought to be conducted.

The growth of the Post Office Department is far beyond the imagination of any man, and it continues to grow so fast that no matter how comprehensive the facilities may be that are employed to meet the present needs, before they are ready for use they have become obsolete.

And how you can conduct a business of this magnitude and keep pace with its growth and have the facilities up to date with which to give the people the kind of service they expect is far beyond my knowledge or the knowledge of any man who has had anything to do with it. Only a little over a year and a half ago we enacted a law to make a 3-cent postage rate. That additional cent was intended to help to pay the cost of the war. It was not intended that the revenues from that source should go into the treasury of the Post Office Department or used in the transaction of postal business. Seventy millions of dollars a year was collected as the result of that increased postage, and when the war was over the law was repealed, and to-day we are on the 2-cent postage basis again. And yet, on the 2-cent postage basis the revenues of the department have increased about 25 per cent over what they were on the 3-cent basis.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman what proportion of the revenues is brought in by the first-class mail?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not remember what it is now, but it used to be about 68 per cent.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will yield, I think he inadvertently made a misstatement there about the amount of revenue last year and this year. He will recall that it was 25 per cent over what the second-class rate a year ago would have produced and 7 per cent over the 3-cent rate.

Mr. MADDEN. That may be true, but I wish to call particular attention to my own city, for example. There, if that may be classed as typical of what is going on in the department work everywhere throughout the United States, the statement I have made is rather under the fact than over the fact. Last month, for example, the receipts in the Chicago post office were \$4,178,000, which is 24.2 per cent greater than for the same month the year before, when 3-cent postage was in vogue, and 41 per cent over what they were the same month a year ago if the 2-cent stamp had been in vogue. So that as a matter of fact the statement I have made is not over, but rather under the facts.

Now, we have during the last year or two increased temporarily the compensation of the men in the Postal Service, and the increase has amounted, as near as I can recall, to about 37 per cent over what the basic salary fixed in 1907 was, while the average increased cost of living has been about 78 per cent. The last increase we made, under what is known as House joint resolution 151, in November last year, averaged about 12½ per cent, and the increases that were made prior to that time averaged about 25 per cent. So that the increased compensation granted to men in the Postal Service has by no means kept pace with the increased cost of living. But it was fortunate for the Postal Service that the Congress had sufficient vision to make these increases as a war measure, for had the Congress not done that we would have had no Postal Service, as it was impossible to get men to serve in the Postal Service at any price. In the city of Detroit alone, where they have only about 1,400 men, the turnover in a single year was more than 3,500. So that it may be said that two and one-half times the number of people in the service in that office had gone out and come in in a single year. In the city of Akron the same may be said to be true. And when I was in Chicago in September, sit-

ting on the commission which is now in session for the purpose of revising the postal salaries and reclassifying the work, we found that they were obliged to take in 1,100 men from the streets, that were not taken from any classified list, and that out of those 1,100 men some would work an hour or two, some a day or two, and some a week or two, but none of the 1,100 or any other part of these extra men ever became qualified for the Postal Service. And the result was that on account of the onerous conditions under which the department was compelled to work during all the period of the war and since the war, they have not had the standard of intelligence among the incoming employees that is requisite for the proper conduct of the department. The men who are in this service must be educated if they are qualified to do the work. They must pass the civil-service examination before entering the service. They must be qualified before entering the service for the work they are called upon to do. The work of a clerk in the Postal Service is not like the work of an ordinary clerk in a department, for the postal clerk must be especially qualified. It takes him at least 10 years in a great office, working every night, before he is qualified for a day job.

So he works under conditions far more difficult than those of the men called into the Government service for clerical employment in various other branches of the Government.

They are also called upon to devote at least two hours every day of their own time, when they are off duty, to the consideration of problems with which they must be familiar in order properly to conduct the service that they are called upon to perform. They are required to study what is known as the scheme work; that is to say, they must understand just when and how to dispatch the letter so that it may get to the first train for delivery to its destination. That involves the learning of 3,000 post offices in the sections for which they are called upon to distribute. It may involve a study of the post offices of a whole State, and they must understand the box into which every letter that comes for any post office among the 3,000 is to go for earliest dispatch. They are not given the time during their working hours to make these studies. They must make these studies at home, and while everybody else in the Government service is permitted to go home when he completes his day's work and do what he pleases with his time off, these men, after going home, are compelled to devote at least two hours every day to the task of qualifying themselves for the work they are required to do when on duty. They are required to be on duty 10 hours every day, during which time they are called upon to work 8 hours, and in addition to that they are called upon to give these other 2 hours of their time. In addition to that they are required to take an examination every 30 days and are compelled in the examination to prove themselves qualified by passing at a standard of excellence equal to 99 per cent out of 100.

And so, you see, a man does not get an opportunity to become rusty in the Post Office Service. If he ever gets rusty, out he goes. And so I say that when we paid these men this additional compensation we did not do the men so much of a service as we did the Government, because we encouraged these men to hope for better things some time, and the last resolution passed by the Congress under which we gave them this small additional compensation in November has done more to facilitate the transaction of the postal business throughout the country than anything else we ever did.

These men, before the passage of that resolution, were downcast, disheartened, discouraged. They had lost hope. They feared that nothing was ever to be done for them. Yet their patriotism prompted them to attend to the business of the service. Although it is provided by law that the hours of service shall be only 8 in every 24, yet these men frequently were called upon to work 16 hours a day. They did it, and they did it without a murmur. They did it because it was necessary, because qualified men could not be had.

And as we go through the country taking testimony on the difficulties that surround the men who are engaged in this great service we wonder at the patriotism which they have displayed in every hour of every day throughout the whole period of the war. They were exempt from the military service under the selective-draft law, but they were not content to remain in the Postal Service. Wherever they could secure relief from the Postal Service they demanded that relief, and they went into the military service, and they came back here to join the force of their fellows again.

I am thankful to realize that we had the foresight while we were passing the draft law to provide that every man who had been in the Postal Service prior to the war and who had left it for the purpose of going into the war should find his place waiting for him on his return; not the place that he left, at the

wages that he then received, but the place that he would have occupied, with the wages then applying to that place, at the period of his return. And I believe it is only fair to say that the Postmaster General has lived up literally to the provisions of the law and has reinstated every man that proved himself qualified and who rendered service to his country during the war.

There are many other things that ought to be done for these men in addition to the increase of the compensation which we have temporarily allowed them, and these things are being considered carefully now by the Postal Commission. The Postal Commission hopes to be able to make their report to the House and Senate within the next 60 days, and it is my earnest hope that when this report comes it will be of such a nature as to justify the appointment of the commission, for it is the belief of every man on that commission that the Postal Service ought to be made as popular as it is possible to make the service throughout the country.

The Postal Service is the people's service, the one great service in which all the people of the United States are interested, the one service that they look forward to every day. They look to see the man in gray coming toward their home every morning with a letter from their loved ones, here, there, and everywhere. These men in gray are the outposts of the Postal Service. They are the men who are in the front, the pickets, so to speak. The clerks, while doing just as patriotic service as the carriers, are not as well known to the people. The people think the Postal Service consists of letter carriers, and letter carriers solely. But it is not true. The letter carrier is the last word in the Postal Service in the delivery of mail. We drop a letter in a box; we go away and leave it; we give it no further consideration. We expect by some means or other that it will be delivered to our friend the next day. Our friends drop a letter in a box and go away and leave it, and expect that we will receive it the next morning. It is true that we do and they do. But the delivery of the letter is the last link in the chain, the last part in the transaction, for after the letter is dropped into the box some one in gray comes along shortly afterwards, quietly, and takes it out, puts it into his bag, puts it on his shoulder, and carries it to the post office, and there puts it on the distribution table, and a clerk dispatches the letter thus carried along through this distribution scheme that I have attempted to describe, and later on the letters are tied in packages, and still later on they are put into a wagon and transferred to the railroad station, put on a railroad train, and there we find in the silent hours of the night these faithful men, who are known as railway mail clerks, distributing this mail as they stand in the aisles of these railway mail trains, facing all the dangers of travel, many of them losing their lives, others being crippled for life as the result of their service and their distribution of the mail through the various towns through which the trains run as we sleep and give the matter no thought.

Then, again, the letter reaches its destination. It is carried from the railway station to the post office, perhaps a fourth-class post office, where the postmaster gets from \$250 to not to exceed \$1,000 a year for the work. The mail is distributed to the people in the neighborhood. If it is a village, it is a third-class post office. If it is in a city, it may be a second-class post office. If it is in a great metropolitan center, it is a first-class post office. There we find this great army of loyal, patriotic men and women working for the amelioration of conditions that are to be corrected throughout the country and delivering us the mail carrying information, messengers of love, condolence, and hope into every home.

We want to popularize the Postal Service. The men in the ranks want to popularize it, and they have done more by their loyalty and patriotism and industry and intelligence to make the Postal Service popular than has ever been done by any man who may have been in charge of the service at the top. Not that the men at the top are not necessary. They are; but the time has come when men can not be appointed to the places at the top because of political influence. The time has come when men must be appointed from the bottom to the top on account of their qualifications, experience, and knowledge, and if we are to perpetuate the popularity of the Postal Service as it has existed, and as I hope it will exist in the future, we must have a body of expert men from the bottom rung to the top rung of the ladder, and there is only one way in which you can get them. That is to put them in at the bottom and let them qualify for the higher places, and then qualify for still higher places as they go up and up, until we have chosen men who have grown up in the service and know every activity in it for every place of any importance. Then you will have an institution speaking for the American people, entering every home in the land—an institution made up of patriotic, loyal men who hold

their places on merit and not through influence. I thank the gentleman now occupying the position of Postmaster General for the inauguration of a system that makes what I have already said partially true, for under his recommendation the fourth-class postmasters are appointed as the result of examination, and third-class postmasters, too; but the time is coming when second-class postmasters and first-class postmasters must be appointed from the ranks of the service, from men who are qualified by knowledge and experience to conduct this great business enterprise, for that is what it is. And not only shall they be qualified and eligible to appointment as second and first class postmasters but to all the great executive branches of the Postal Service in Washington, from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General up to the Postmaster General himself. Then the people may hope to see an enterprise conducted along economical, scientific business lines, managed by men who are trained in a work as to which they have expert knowledge, and then and then only can we hope to perpetuate the Post Office Department as a people's institution and manage it systematically and economically.

In days gone by we have given the Postmaster General authority to name what are known as accounting officers, one in every county; so that to-day instead of having 53,000 reports of transactions coming from 53,000 postmasters to the office of the Postmaster General we have only 3,000, one for each county. But even that system must be reformed, for it is not fair to make third and fourth class postmasters accounting officers. In this bill we have given to the Postmaster General the authority to name only second and first class post offices as accounting offices. Those offices have clerks, they have executive officers, they can qualify to do the work, and under this authority it will be possible for the Postmaster General to reduce still further the number of accounting offices and the number of accounts in this great department here in this city.

We are progressing slowly toward the stage of perfection. The progress must be slow, because the Congress has been jealous of its prerogatives. The Congress has hesitated to give to the Postmaster General authority which any great administrative officer ought to have. Some people have refused to give it because the Postmaster General is Mr. Burleson. Some have refused to give it because it is the Postmaster General, regardless of the personality of the man. I am one of those who believe that, no matter what a man's name may be or what his politics, the administrative officer of a great department like the Post Office Department ought, if we expect efficient management from him, to be given the right to determine questions of policy, and he ought to be given discretionary power in great matters of business such as he has to deal with here; and until we give that discretionary power to the Postmaster General we will still be handicapped by having in many instances to pay a dollar and a half for seventy-five cents worth of work.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman whether he has thought over the question of the crowded condition of the post offices in the country, especially in the large cities. In our city of Baltimore we have efficiency, but it is very difficult to keep up the efficiency in the crowded conditions which have resulted from the establishment of the parcel post and the great increase of business.

Mr. MADDEN. As I said in the beginning of my statement, the marvelous growth of the business of the department makes me wonder how any man, no matter what vision he may have, can see the needs of the Postal Service and supply the machinery with which to conduct that service; because just about the time we get what we think is the most efficient machinery that can be had we find that it is obsolete on account of the continued growth of the service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In counties where there are only fourth-class postmasters, where is the accounting office going to be?

Mr. MADDEN. In such cases they will have to take in more than one county, and send the accounting to the place where they have a first or second class post office.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Suppose they have a great, big county?

Mr. MADDEN. There will be some cases of that kind, but in order to obviate the difficulty existing under the present system there must be greater latitude given to the Postmaster General, and he must be given the right to name men in first and second class post offices as accounting officers.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What I had in mind when I asked the question was the building occupied by the post office.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I had in mind. Take Chicago. We have no post office worthy of the name. We started in 1912 with a post office that was adequate to supply the needs at that time. Our revenues were then \$12,000,000 a year. To-day our revenues are \$40,000,000 a year, and we remain in the same office.

Take Boston; I think that post office is the shame of the century. It is not fit for a dog to live in, to say nothing of men working in it. It is an outrage. The same is true of St. Paul and of many other places. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is naught that I can say that would add to what has already been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who has preceded me and who has in a masterly manner described to the House the situation which exists in this great country of ours relative to its postal needs. To me it would be like painting the lily or filling the cup already full for anyone to add or embellish what he has so well said. I regard the gentleman from Illinois as the valedictorian in presenting the case on postal matters to the House. I did not rise to pay him a personal tribute, but in simple justice I pay him this courtesy for his fidelity to the Postal Service and as a most useful member of the committee, and particularly do I concur in his opinion and declared hope that the entire postal system will soon be operated by men trained and developed from the ranks. I subscribe to all that he has said in toto. Such a reform in the system, I am aware, would be by some regarded as revolutionary from a political or partisan standpoint, but the postal system transcends partisanship or politics; it is tremendous in its scope and its ramifications and is a gigantic problem which concerns the entire citizenry of the Nation.

The gentleman from Illinois has called it the people's institution. I designate it the people's university. It is more than an institution; it is more than a college, with its intricate branches and subdivisions, some of which are the Railway Mail Service inspectors, clerks, carriers, auditors, and administrative officers. Gentlemen, it is a most instructive university, of which every American citizen is a student, the teaching staff being the operatives and the Postmaster General and his assistants the faculty.

It needs no compelling argument to realize that this great army of 300,000 loyal, efficient, and patriotic Americans are deserving of the advantages proposed in the bill under consideration. You and I have both known many of our public and high school comrades who have entered the Postal Service.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to add one thing: That in our investigation of the New England postal needs it was a revelation to find that nearly every man in the service was a college man.

Mr. DONOVAN. I am not at all surprised at that statement. I was born and reared in New England and speak particularly from observation and knowledge in regard to my former schoolmates in Connecticut, many of whom, upon completing their high-school course, entered the Postal Service. I have a country home in that State near my native city and during vacation periods frequently meet schoolmates of my boyhood days, many of whom have given 25 to 30 of the best years of their lives in unselfish service to the Government. Many are aged in a marked degree in comparison with other boyhood schoolmates who were no more talented than those who entered the Postal Service, but who affiliated their talents and energies with less exacting, time consuming, and laborious employment. The Post Office Department demanded recruits equipped with high educational and physical prowess, and these recruits entered the service, proud of the distinction of being chosen by their Government for a position of responsibility and trust. They had hoped that by fidelity to that trust the Government would reward them. Soon, however, age with its attendant cares crept upon them, and in most instances having families to support, their hope of reward was dimmed by the Government's delay in showing by commensurate compensation its appreciation of the great service rendered by them.

The Postal System is in its very nature a monopoly. It has no competitors. The men and women in the service become trained specialists, and those who remain in the service until middle life find no other market where they can sell their

talents and skill, and are thereby foreclosed from taking up other activities which would give them more leisure and greater compensation.

It is reassuring to note that this bill is more generous than any yet proposed and I heartily support it and urge its enactment into law, with the confident hope that the day is not far distant when the postal employee who epitomizes the ideal American public servant will be fully compensated for his or her efficient and loyal service to the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I was particularly gratified with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I know that he has been a constant student on postal matters and a great friend of the postal employees. I know it is largely through his influence and work that salaries have been increased and that these men are now or will shortly be paid sufficient remuneration upon which to live. I am particularly gratified with the fact that Baltimore has such a splendid service, such a fine personnel, both in its clerks, its letter carriers, and the entire force of that city. My great wonderment is the fact that they are able to carry on the work as efficiently as they do in the face of the crowded condition of our post office. Many of our men are crowded into a basement, working with a poor light, mostly artificial light, endeavoring to carry on the postal work of the city that has grown to tremendous proportions, now having something over 700,000 inhabitants.

Since the Postal Service has been inaugurated and the work of the postal department has grown so enormously, it seems to me that Congress should undertake to get enlarged accommodations throughout the country. I know that in many of the post offices a great deal of space has been sacrificed to architectural effect. We might have had more light if we had had less architecture, and the result is that now we have very crowded conditions, and that obtains throughout the land.

I rise particularly to call attention of the House to the fact that if the other cities are crowded as Baltimore is crowded in its postal building, then certainly something should be done to enlarge the facilities for carrying on this work. I would like to see post offices constructed or enlarged throughout the country along the same line that a business man would enlarge his business buildings. We do not find the business interests of the country trying to carry on a tremendously increased business in a small structure, but we find them enlarging their business buildings, so that they may carry on the enlarged business, and that should be the case with the Post Office Department. I think we should undertake the construction of new postal buildings wherever they are necessary. For myself I should like to see the buildings for separate cities considered in separate bills, so that each city could go before the committee and present its necessities and then have the House act upon those bills. Something must be done. It is not just, it is not fair, it is not reasonable to expect these men to carry on this great work in the crowded conditions we find everywhere, using the artificial light that must be used.

I hope this Congress will take up the subject and force it to a conclusion, so that we may soon find ourselves with better facilities for carrying on this tremendous work, which means something to practically everyone in the land, rich or poor, for everyone enjoys the postal facilities of the country. The post office is their pride, it is the one thing they need every day, and it is the one thing which should be equipped to the very highest point of efficiency. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield those 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE].

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the statements made by members of this committee who have in charge one of the great agencies of the Government. What has been said has been instructive and interesting. It is not my purpose, however, to speak on this subject, but I desire to address myself to a subject entirely foreign to it. I hesitate to do so, however, if there be any member of the committee or of the House who wishes to discuss the bill itself in the time that is allotted to me. If no one does, I shall proceed with what I had intended to say.

Mr. Chairman, to all lovers of America the fires of patriotism that swept our country in 1917 will never cease to be a source of unbounded pride and satisfaction. Many had despaired of the existence of such love of country as would carry and sustain us through a great war. As a Nation we had long lived a life of luxury and self-indulgence, as the result of the rapidly expanding wealth and the accumulation of the good things of life. More than 50 years had elapsed since the close of the last great

war, and its grim and desperate features were familiar by personal experience to but few outside the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic and the Confederate Veterans. Not a few feared that in the extremities of a great war we might prove what the Germans, and even the people of some other European nations, thought we would prove, a Nation of shopkeepers and dollar lovers, physically and spiritually too poor to sustain a great and noble cause. They thought we might justify the prophetic forecast of the poet—

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Happily, however, when the call to war came on the 6th of April, 1917, these fears were not realized—the people sprung to the defense of their country in the most spontaneous and gratifying way. Patriots in every walk of life strove to do what each individually could do to further the cause of our country. Doubtless we shall never again witness such an inspiring and generous unanimity in a great cause as that which existed throughout America in 1917 and 1918. There was a passion for sacrifice for country which was shared by rich and poor, by youth and age, by men, women, and children. The rich gave of their time and their wealth; the poor of whatever they had; and both joined in raising millions for the Red Cross and other beneficent organizations for the relief of our men in the camps and field. Age contributed the value of experience and foresight; youth—best of all—gave its brawn and muscle, sacrificed some of its best years, and many gave the supreme gift of all—life itself—to the great cause. Men gave all the masculine attributes to the national purpose—power, courage, sacrifice, and all the manly virtues—women contributed all the sweetness and sacrifice which is the crowning feature of their character, the service at home, in the camp, in the field—everywhere—whereby the brave soldiers might be kept in touch with the comforts of civil life, and braced up in heart and hope for the complete discomforts and dire dangers of a soldier's life.

As a people we took a sort of grim pleasure in submitting ourselves to the unaccustomed restrictions, conservation orders of food administrations, fuel administrations, railway administrations, war trade boards, shipping boards, press censorships, unappetizing things to eat and drink, high prices for food and clothes, because we felt that we were doing something for our country. Such was the "spirit of 1917."

Congress regrettably voted on April 6, 1917, that the state of war with Germany existed, and the country emphatically sustained Congress. A logical sequence to the declaration of war was the passage of the selective-draft law, which was even a greater strain upon the heartstrings of Congress than the fateful declaration itself, and again the country sustained Congress. Then came the trying days of the draft, when the boys were being taken from their employments and their homes, and it was wonderful how the country passed through that stormy period. The finest thing of all, however, was the soldiers—the officers and men. There were all manner of unaccustomed discomforts at the camps—unfurnished and windowless barracks, cold and rain, severe drills day after day, often undersupply of clothing, and other shortcomings due to inexperience and newness of everything. In many camps they were short of guns even for drilling purposes. These conditions were bad for both officers and men. But through it all, while we knew that these shortcomings existed, the men displayed a splendid fortitude. They were gradually being drilled into a magnificent army. Those who came in slouching and careless in action soon became erect, of fine bearing, quick and snappy soldiers. The change was marvelous.

Soon the eyes of the American people turned to France. First, Gen. Pershing, with a small force of Americans, saluted at the grave of the early friend of America and reported in the historic four words, "Lafayette, we are here!"

Followed thousands upon thousands of brave American soldiers, crossing the broad and tempestuous Atlantic, often in great discomfort. Enormous landing places, great ports in themselves, were constructed in France. Railways, telegraph lines, great hospitals, and vast camps were constructed. Before the end more than 2,000,000 of gallant American soldiers were in France, making good the declaration of their commander in chief at the tomb of Lafayette. This vast army was transported through seas swarming with the deadly and destructive submarines and explosive mines of Germany; and yet, due to the vigilance and skill of the magnificent American Navy, not a single soldier was lost through those dreaded and destructive agencies of the enemy who was on an American ship and conveyed by the American Navy. This wonderful testimony to the efficiency of our Navy, not yet fully understood and appreciated, will constitute one of the most impressive and gratifying pages of history of the war when that history is fully written.

As our splendid Army, evolved from the ranks of a free people not given to military exploits of conquest and close organization, was on the ground in Europe earlier than had been anticipated, so it also appeared on the field of battle sooner than was anticipated by the enemy or even by our allies. With rare magnanimity Gen. Pershing first permitted units of our Army to fill out the decimated armies of Great Britain and France, thus strengthening the allies' line, "with its back to the wall," as the gallant British general, Haig, had termed the situation, defending the approaches to Calais and Paris.

With what anxiety did the Nation at home contemplate the earlier entrances of American troops into the bloody conflict? We had great confidence in them, but we fully realized that modern war had perfected the methods of human destruction and that it was all new to our brave boys. Our hopes and prayers were with them. When the news came of their splendid courage and effective participation in the battle at Cantigny and later at Chateau-Thierry, where the last and greatest German onslaught to Paris and the sea was effectually stemmed by American soldiers and marines, and we realized that our men had had their "baptism of fire" and had come out with distinguished honor, a wave of happiness and pride swept across the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to distant Alaska, and to our islands in the seas. Rapidly following, came Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, and the long and terrible battle of the Argonne Forest. Many other battles were fought, and everywhere our gallant officers and men maintained a high place for courage and achievement, and in every action of the hundreds in which from first to last they engaged, never once did they fail to uphold the splendid traditions of the American Army, bulwarked on gallant deeds stretching from the War of the Revolution, through the Mexican War, accentuated in the hundreds of battles of the Civil War, and closing at Appamattox, through the Spanish War and the Philippine Insurrection, down to the present day.

All honor to the American soldiers and sailors, from the general and admiral commanding down through the various grades to the humblest private in the ranks and the sailors on the decks and the stoker in the fire rooms of our dreadnaughts and submarine chasers—every one of the 4,000,000 men—whether they succeeded in their universal desire to go overseas or not. Each one showed his patriotic wish to serve his country and his fellow men, even though it might cost that which all men most value—life itself. Every branch of American society was embraced in this modern crusade—every calling and every profession. The farmer deserted his fields, the blacksmith his forge, the lawyer his briefs, the merchant his store, the engineer his instruments of precision. These men so recently engaged in peaceful occupations soon found themselves in entirely new conditions and in various divisions of the military service. How splendidly did they play their parts in whatever branch of the service they found themselves, whether that service was upon the solid earth, upon the rolling seas, or in the unstable air; whether in the Infantry, the Cavalry, the Artillery, the Tank Service, or whatever remained on the ground; whether on battleship, cruiser, torpedo-boat destroyer, or submarine on the water; or whether in observation balloons along the battle line or in airplanes sailing over the enemy armies, fighting his airplanes and noting the disposition and movement of his troops.

Among all the 4,000,000 brave Americans who offered themselves, if need be, for the great sacrifice, the members of no profession responded more freely or placed themselves more absolutely at the disposal of their country than did those of the medical profession. We might not go beyond the truth to say that in proportion to their numbers, and because of the highly essential nature of the services which they could render their country, they volunteered with greater freedom and with less regard to their personal fortunes and individual interests than the members of any others of the learned or scientific professions. Personally I knew dozens—perhaps hundreds—of instances where members of their noble profession left valuable and lucrative practice and—what is still more dear to the masculine heart—beautiful and loving wives and children for the hard labor in rude hospitals, in camps, and adjacent to hard-contested battle fields, for compensation so small as to but poorly sustain their families, who had before enjoyed most comfortable and well-provided homes. They are worthy of all honor. How many lives of our brave boys they have saved; how many through their skillful ministrations have been brought back to physical fitness, of value to themselves and to society. Never should we for a moment forget their splendid and brave assistants, of frailer physique but of the same stout and devoted hearts, the female nurses. All these noble and

splendid conservers of human capacity for the physical work of life and of life itself should be held by all Americans in eternal respect, honor, and love. The little five-pointed metal star which henceforth they are entitled to wear, like the small copper button of the veterans of the Civil War, should carry with it a peculiar significance, entitling its wearer to the salute which honors brave deeds and service to country—if not the physical salute, then the salute in mind and spirit which honors and reveres the defenders of America.

Here in Congress, my colleagues, let us who represent all these brave soldiers, who represent the fathers and mothers and the wives who consented to their going and bade them farewell with God's blessing, never forget their services to the country. We owe them a duty to remember them in our legislation. Let us not permit ourselves in the pressure of general legislation, which all of us feel from day to day, to forget to do them justice, particularly those who suffer from wounds or disease. Let us not permit the requirements of form and red tape to prevent them from receiving the consideration and benefits which Congress really desires that they shall have. Our plans for these brave men have not in all cases worked out as well as we had hoped they would.

Let us revise and amend these laws wherever needed, always keeping in mind the duty that the American people and the American Congress owe to the heroes who braved death for their country on land, on sea, and in the air—at Cantigny, at Chateau-Thierry, at St. Mihiel, at Belleau Wood, and a hundred other battle fields. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to confine my remarks to this Post Office appropriation bill. That field has been thoroughly covered by gentlemen who preceded me. In working on this appropriation bill, beginning some time prior to the time when the committee held its hearings, and comparing the appropriations of this bill with the expenditures of the Post Office in previous years, I pursued my investigations to the total national expenditures from the foundation of our Government to the present time, ending with our current expenditures, revenues, and the status of our bonded indebtedness.

This Post Office appropriation bill carries appropriations for the fiscal year of 1921, which commences July 1 next. The total amount of this bill is \$461,728,368, which is more for this one department of government than it took in the early nineties to pay for all the activities of the Government. In 1892 the total expenditures of the Government were only \$445,382,293, an amount less than the amount we authorize in this bill for the Post Office Department alone for the fiscal year 1921.

When we go back to the beginning of our Government and follow the growth of the national expenditures to the present time, it is apparent that the growth of national expenditures is out of all proportion to our growth in either population or wealth. In Washington's administration, from September 2, 1789, to December 31, 1791, a period of over two years, the total national expenditures were \$3,797,436.78. His second term was more expensive; the highest annual expenditures were \$10,435,069.65 in 1795. The highest annual expenditures during the administration of John Adams were \$11,989,739.92 in 1800. In Jefferson's administration the highest annual expenditures were \$16,764,584.20 in 1808.

During the Madison administration we had the War of 1812. The highest annual expenditures during that war were \$39,190,520.36 in 1813, a little over \$22,000,000 more than the highest annual expenditures during the previous administration. Our school histories lead us to believe that the War of 1812 was a great war, but it is evident that war then did not cost so much as it does now.

Coming on down through the administrations of Monroe, John Q. Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, and Harrison and Tyler we find the annual expenditures varying from \$12,000,000 during the administration of Tyler to \$39,000,000 during Van Buren's administration. The Mexican War occurred during Polk's administration. This was another great war, according to our school histories. The highest annual expenditures during this administration were \$59,451,177.65 in 1847, or \$20,000,000 more than the high-water mark of the Van Buren administration.

I do not want to weary the House with these figures, so I will hasten. The highest annual expenditures prior to the Civil War were \$83,751,511.57 in 1859. During the Civil War the expenditures increased greatly. The highest were for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1865, when they were \$1,897,674,224.09. Then

they decreased rapidly. The lowest annual expenditures since the Civil War were for 1869, and the amount for that year was \$321,490,597.75. It will be interesting to note in passing that this sum is almost four times more than the highest annual expenditures before the Civil War.

From 1875 to 1889 the national expenditures exceeded the \$400,000,000 mark but once. Since 1889 there has been a constant increase until the three years preceding our entrance into the World War—1914, 1915, and 1916—the annual expenditures for each of those years exceeded the billion-dollar mark.

The annual expenditures during the World War, according to the figures given to me in a letter from the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, were as follows:

1917	\$3,046,183,746.19
1918	21,813,356,508.39
1919	18,514,000,000.00

Now, let us come down to the problem we have before us for the next fiscal year, for which Congress must authorize appropriations prior to June 30 next. I submit here for the Record in parallel columns the total expenditures of each department for the fiscal year 1916, the year before the war, and what the administration asks for the fiscal year 1921, the year after the war. At any rate, we hope the war will be legally ended by the 1st of next July.

	Expenditures for fiscal year 1916.	Administration estimates for fiscal year 1921.
Legislative	\$13,848,037.16	\$19,844,984.95
Executive proper	395,949.11	2,221,224.00
State Department	6,444,594.11	12,920,607.91
Treasury Department	121,376,214.33	1,674,293,922.85
Independent bureaus and offices	7,221,833.24	508,743,449.59
District of Columbia	13,633,853.15	23,285,318.03
War Department	106,853,552.23	1,208,901,535.32
Navy Department	165,883,194.66	583,674,133.87
Interior Department	201,058,832.61	294,370,826.81
Post Office Department	213,499,162.87	395,837,543.03
Department of Agriculture	28,031,540.33	72,568,102.00
Department of Commerce	11,495,722.17	35,795,038.49
Department of Labor	5,531,144.47	8,974,574.60
Department of Justice	10,862,483.28	17,946,471.35
Panama Canal	17,503,728.07	18,245,391.00
Adjustment of miscellaneous accounts	1,016,810.50	
Total	1,072,894,093.23	4,855,410,031.62

Comparing the figures in these columns is most interesting. Every Government activity shows an increase. Some of the increases are astounding. Most of these increases can and will be reduced, with the exception of the Post Office Department. This department is the only department of Government that pays for itself. The increase in this department represents the natural growth of business of that department and the increases to the employees made necessary by the increased cost of living. The salary increases were not estimated by the department, which accounts for the committee's increase over the department's estimate.

I call your attention to the increase for the Treasury Department. This includes over a billion dollars for interest on our national debt and for benefits to the soldiers and sailors through the War Risk Insurance Bureau. These amounts can not and will not be reduced.

Now I call your attention to the astounding increase asked for by the War Department. The year prior to the war we spent for the Army \$166,853,552.23. For next year they ask \$1,208,901,535.32, about eight times the highest amount expended before the war and more than it cost to operate every activity of the Government before the war. I do not want to discuss the league of nations at this time, but permit me to make this observation in passing. Last summer when it appeared that the league would be forced through the Senate just as it came from the secret peace conference at Paris the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, with the knowledge and approval of the President undoubtedly, appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and proposed a military program which, among other things, provided for a peace-time standing army of 576,000 men. Knowing that such a standing army could not be raised and maintained in time of peace by voluntary enlistments, the program further provided for conscription in time of peace to keep up this standing army and for authority to send the Army to any part of the world where mandates might be assumed or police required. After it became evident that the league could not pass the Senate without strong American reservations, Gen. Pershing last fall appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee and testified that in his judgment a standing Army of 250,000 men would be sufficient. If this appropriation for the War Department can be cut down in the same proportion, a material saving can be made on this one item alone.

The Navy is a little more modest. The year before the war the Navy cost \$155,883,194.66. The amount asked for next year is \$580,674,133.87. As I am going to place this table in the Record, Members can for themselves make comparisons of the other departments and bureaus.

The total amount expended for the year prior to the war was \$1,072,894,093.23. The amount demanded by the administration for next year, which does not include salary increases to Government employees and other items heretofore called to the attention of Congress, such as deficiencies on war contracts, railroads, good roads, and so forth, is \$4,855,410,031.62.

Mr. MADDEN. There is about a billion to be added.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman is correct in his statement; so that the amount is more nearly \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And the interest on the public debt besides.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The interest on the public debt is included in the increase provided for the Treasury Department, to which I called the attention of the House a moment ago.

Mr. MADDEN. On which the interest is \$1,017,000,000. And there was \$75,000,000 in the last year's Post Office bill for good roads, and at least \$400,000,000 will have to be paid to the railroads, which are not included in the estimates, and \$250,000,000 increased compensation.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I thank the gentleman for his statement, because I know he speaks with authority on this subject.

THE NATIONAL DEBT.

The national debt, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, was \$971,562,590 on June 30, 1916. On June 30, 1919, it was \$25,484,506,160.05. By next June 30, by the same authority, the debt will be \$26,516,506,160.05.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit, if bonds had been issued to cover the deficit of \$3,050,000,000, it would amount to about \$30,000,000,000.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Right here let me state that it is my understanding that there are about \$23,000,000,000 of the debt in bonds—war bonds—and that the rest of the debt of \$3,000,000,000 is in Treasury certificates, which are renewed every six months. Is the deficit to which the gentleman refers in the Treasury certificates?

Mr. MADDEN. There is a \$3,000,000,000 deficit that is covered by the certificates. And, further, we have contract adjustments due to the unfinished and unadjudicated contracts for the war which will probably involve over two or three billion dollars more.

Mr. RAMSEYER. According to the Treasury Department, the cost of the war was \$32,000,000,000. But I know that that does not include many things that have not yet been paid for, and which will have to be paid for; and there is no doubt in my mind that the war has cost considerably more than \$32,000,000,000.

To pay the annual interest on the national debt will require the raising of revenues of over \$1,000,000,000. For a number of years to come the interest on the national debt will be about the same as the total annual expenditures before the war.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure the collocation of figures here is of interest to men who want to make value of them. But what idea has the gentleman of giving value to the country by putting all these figures in the Record?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Members here not only have the right to know, and should know, but the people also have a right to know what is the status of our national finances.

Mr. BLANTON. I was trying to gather whether it was the gentleman's idea that we should profit by these figures by beginning a sure-enough bona fide course of economy here.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is something about which I shall have something to say before I conclude. We have had preaching enough about economy. It is easy to preach economy. I am sure the gentleman will join me with acts and deeds of economy.

The credits established by the Secretary of the Treasury in favor of foreign Governments since April 6, 1917, were at the close of the business day of October 24, 1919, as follows:

Belgium	\$343,445,000.00
Cuba	10,000,000.00
Czechoslovakia	55,330,000.00
France	3,047,974,777.24
Great Britain	4,277,000,000.00
Greece	\$48,236,429.05
Italy	1,620,922,872.99
Liberia	5,000,000.00
Roumania	25,000,000.00
Russia	187,729,750.00
Serbia	26,780,465.56

Total..... 9,647,419,494.84

It will be observed that the 11 foreign Governments to which we made loans during the war owe us nearly \$10,000,000,000. For these loans we hold from the 11 foreign Governments demand certificates of indebtedness which bear interest equivalent to the rate of 5 per cent per annum, but arrangements have been made with these Governments by the Treasury Department to provide for the funding of the interest on these obligations for the next three years. In other words, these Governments will pay us no interest during the next three years, amounting to over \$400,000,000 annually. During this period this interest will be paid by the American taxpayer. In a letter to me the Treasury Department explains this arrangement as follows:

In view of the present derangement of the foreign exchanges, it would add to the difficulties of the situation and would not be to the advantage of the United States to require cash payment of interest.

Whether these foreign loans will ever be paid back is problematical. Some of them will be, undoubtedly, and I hope all. It is a fact that we have been urged to cancel them. I will never consent to that. While in France last spring I was reliably informed that certain of the European nations urged before the peace conference that we should assume a proportionate part of the allied war debts incurred before our entrance into the war. We will pay the debt we made and no more. Our Government has even been approached to guarantee the German indemnity to the allied nations. On this point the following Paris dispatch carried in our metropolitan press December 31, 1919, is significant:

Discussing the loan, Alexander Ribot asked Premier Clemenceau regarding guaranteeing of the German indemnity by the Allies. The premier replied, "That can not be taken up now because of the situation in Washington."

We must attend to it that the "situation" in Washington remains unchanged on this subject.

REVENUES TO MEET EXPENDITURES.

From 1866 to 1910 practically all the revenues to meet national expenditures were raised by indirect taxation, chiefly from customs duties and from internal revenue. These indirect taxes were paid by the people in a manner that did not call to their especial attention when and how much they contributed to the support of their National Government. However, with direct taxes in vogue since 1910, and especially during the World War, it is very different. The taxpayer knows when and how much he contributes to the maintenance of the National Government, and most naturally he will be inclined to hold to a stricter account the public servants who are intrusted with the expenditure of the public funds.

As an illustration of the transition from indirect taxation to direct taxation, I quote Mr. Goon, of Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in his report on the national budget system:

For the fiscal year 1909 the total ordinary receipts aggregated \$603,589,489.84, of which \$300,711,933.95 came from customs duties, \$246,212,643.59 came from internal revenue, and the balance was received from the sale of public lands and other miscellaneous items, whereas for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the total receipts from customs amounted to \$184,457,867.39, while the internal revenue, including income taxes and corporation and excess-profits taxes, amounted to \$3,839,950,612.05.

It is thus seen that in the future by far the greater part of the revenue required for conducting the public business must come from direct taxes. This, coupled with the further fact that the ordinary expenses for running the Government will in the future probably exceed \$4,000,000,000 a year, will cause the public to take a much greater interest than heretofore in appropriations by Congress. The political issues of the future will not be centered around the tariff but rather around the problems of economy as reflected in the appropriations made by Congress. If this is true, Congress must place itself in a position where it can meet these problems in the most efficient way. The soundest and most approved methods of business transactions must be adopted by Congress if it is to perform well and efficiently the duties which this new condition creates.

Prior to the World War during nearly every fiscal year there was a surplus of receipts over the expenditures. To be more specific, from 1866 to 1917, inclusive, the receipts exceeded the expenditures for each year with the exception of 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1905, 1908, 1909, 1915, and 1917. The total amount by which the expenditures exceeded the receipts for the 11 years just named is \$443,766,744.70. For the 52 fiscal years, 1866 to 1917, inclusive, the receipts exceeded the expenditures in 41 years, the total of such excesses for that period being \$2,591,453,184.16.

The total receipts of the National Government during the war (not including moneys received from the sale of bonds) for each fiscal year ending June 30 were as follows:

1917	\$1,452,302,845.80
1918	4,003,022,472.42
1919	5,515,882,546.40
1920 (estimated, including sales of war property)	6,203,000,000.00

It is estimated by experts of the Treasury Department and in Congress that for some years to come our national expenditures annually will not be less than \$4,000,000,000, and possibly as high as \$5,000,000,000. This is on the assumption, of course, that the world will settle down soon on a peace basis. It is generally conceded by gentlemen in a position to know that we can not greatly increase the total revenue receipts by indirect taxation over what they were before the war, and especially in 1910, when we collected \$333,683,445 from customs duties alone, the highest ever collected in any one year from that source. So one thing is quite certain, that by far the greater portion of the revenues to be raised hereafter must be raised by direct taxation.

I have sought an opportunity to make this statement so that all who are interested in our national finances can get a clearer grasp of this very important and vital subject. Congress enacts laws to raise the revenues and makes appropriations authorizing the expenditure of moneys in the Treasury; but the administration, through the various executive departments, spends the money. Because of the greatly enlarged expenditures for the Government in the future it behooves Congress to keep a closer check on the spending departments of the Government. Most of the money to be expended in the future will come directly from the pockets of the people; and the people will hold every public official to the strictest economy, and very justly so.

The people will cheerfully pay the interest and principal on the national debt incurred in winning the World War. They will gladly pay for any generous provisions and benefits to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who made possible the winning of the war. They will not murmur because they are taxed to maintain any legitimate Government enterprise. But hereafter economy must be the watchword. Waste, extravagance, useless offices, and questionable ventures must be eliminated by the National Government. On the other hand, to meet the necessary annual expenditures of the Government and to pay off the national debt, it will be necessary for the people as a whole to practice economy in their daily life and to produce more. A nation in debt, as an individual in debt, can get out from under the debt only by working and saving. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following:

Total annual expenditures by the United States Government from Sept. 2, 1789, to June 30, 1920.

Administration:	Total expenditures.
George Washington—	
From Sept. 2, 1789, to Dec. 31, 1791	\$3,797,436.78
1792	9,141,509.67
1793	7,529,575.55
1794	9,302,124.74
1795	10,435,069.65
1796	8,367,770.84
John Adams—	
1797	8,626,012.78
1798	8,613,517.68
1799	11,077,043.50
1800	11,989,739.92
Thomas Jefferson—	
1801	12,273,376.94
1802	13,276,084.67
1803	11,258,983.67
1804	12,624,646.36
1805	13,727,124.41
1806	15,070,093.97
1807	11,292,292.99
1808	16,764,584.20
James Madison—	
1809	13,867,226.30
1810	13,319,986.74
1811	13,601,808.91
1812	22,279,121.15
1813	39,190,520.36
1814	38,028,230.32
1815	39,582,493.35
1816	48,244,495.51
James Monroe—	
1817	40,877,646.04
1818	35,104,875.40
1819	24,004,199.73
1820	21,763,024.85
1821	19,090,572.69
1822	17,676,592.63
1823	15,314,171.00
1824	31,898,538.47
John Q. Adams—	
1825	23,585,804.72
1826	24,102,398.40
1827	22,656,764.04
1828	25,459,479.52
Andrew Jackson—	
1829	25,044,358.40
1830	24,585,281.55
1831	30,038,446.12
1832	34,356,698.06
1833	24,257,298.49
1834	24,601,982.44
1835	17,573,141.56
1836	30,868,164.04

Administration—Continued.

	Total expenditures.
Martin Van Buren—	
1837	\$33,830,097.21
1838	39,455,438.35
1839	37,614,936.15
1840	26,643,656.12
Harrison and Tyler—	
1841	32,025,070.70
1842	32,930,876.53
1843	12,118,105.15
1844	33,642,010.85
James K. Polk—	
1845	29,968,206.98
1846	28,031,114.20
1847	59,451,177.65
1848	58,241,167.24
Taylor and Fillmore—	
1849	57,631,667.82
1850	43,002,168.69
1851	48,005,878.68
1852	46,712,608.83
Franklin Pierce—	
1853	54,577,061.74
1854	75,354,630.26
1855	66,164,775.96
1856	72,726,341.57
James Buchanan—	
1857	70,822,724.85
1858	82,062,186.74
1859	83,751,511.57
1860	77,462,102.72
Abraham Lincoln—	
1861	84,578,834.47
1862	570,841,700.25
1863	895,796,630.65
1864	865,234,087.86
Lincoln and Johnson—	
1865	1,897,674,224.09
1866	1,141,072,666.09
1867	840,729,129.33
1868	377,340,284.86
Ulysses S. Grant—	
1869	321,490,597.75
1870	703,155,391.44
1871	692,238,332.40
1872	682,360,760.17
1873	524,044,597.91
1874	408,358,615.00
1875	377,716,938.00
1876	365,344,356.00
Rutherford B. Hayes—	
1877	338,458,987.00
1878	339,465,202.00
1879	405,725,732.00
1880	397,148,016.00
Garfield and Arthur—	
1881	384,752,946.00
1882	369,540,668.00
1883	367,851,213.00
1884	345,929,182.00
Grover Cleveland—	
1885	361,659,426.00
1886	344,068,029.00
1887	368,679,951.00
1888	360,837,281.00
Benjamin Harrison—	
1889	385,315,219.00
1890	400,095,319.00
1891	465,979,339.00
1892	445,382,293.00
Grover Cleveland—	
1893	492,324,027.00
1894	480,360,798.00
1895	474,352,879.00
1896	478,497,145.00
William McKinley—	
1897	497,642,512.00
1898	578,984,163.00
1899	746,601,266.00
1900	635,614,393.00
McKinley and Roosevelt—	
1901	657,865,253.00
1902	625,084,600.00
1903	673,429,859.00
1904	739,246,428.00
Theodore Roosevelt—	
1905	755,350,207.00
1906	752,163,780.00
1907	766,424,575.00
1908	850,880,415.00
William H. Taft—	
1909	905,132,383.00
1910	911,025,594.00
1911	913,098,258.00
1912	925,695,713.00
Woodrow Wilson—	
1913	967,737,255.00
1914	1,006,662,216.00
1915	1,052,848,682.00
1916	1,072,894,093.23
1917	3,046,183,746.19
1918	21,813,356,508.39
1919	18,514,000,000.00
1920, estimated	11,476,627,219.00

Mr. BLACK. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has six minutes remaining and the gentleman from Minnesota four minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yesterday the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. BLANTON], in his usual energetic manner, called attention to the fact that he desired legislation in regard to these unusual conditions due to the oil developments of Texas. He criticized the Republican side of the House, because he said there were only 13 or 14 of them who were here when this item of legislation, in which he was interested, was pending, and intimated that the party was deserving of criticism. But it seems to me the gentleman had no grievance. He stated himself that these conditions in Texas arose a year ago, and the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH] said they arose a year and a half ago. So that for nearly a year, or, anyway, nine months, before the Republicans got control of the House of Representatives these conditions existed in Texas and no attempt at legislation was made. The Post Office appropriation act was not finally adopted until the 28th of February. It seems to me that they could, if these conditions were so critical, have attended to it then, as they controlled the Congress. The first the present chairman of the Post Office Committee heard of this was in October last, when we had under consideration a conference report on House joint resolution 151, when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] criticized the committee, and stated that he had called the attention of the department to it, and the department had requested legislation of the Post Office Committee. I felt that it was an unfounded statement at the time so far as the committee was concerned. I believed the gentleman was mistaken as to which committee he referred, because, it being an emergency, it was the usual course, if it was requested at all, to request it from the Appropriation Committee, and therefore I felt that the Post Office Committee was not derelict in any way. But I wrote to the Postmaster General, and I will have the answer read in a few minutes. I want to quote these words from it. It is dated November 12, 1919, and it says:

In compliance with your request for advice as to the situation in the post office referred to by Mr. BLANTON, I wish to say that while I do not know the name of the office in question the departmental records fail to indicate the necessity for legislation to provide for payment in excess of the present maximum rate of \$1,000 per annum to postmasters at offices of the fourth class. The difficulty experienced by the department in securing postmasters has been negligible, and while there have been a considerable number of resignations at the smaller offices, this condition is to be expected, and no serious difficulty has been experienced in filling vacancies thus caused.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I send this letter, with memorandum, to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 12, 1919.

HON. HALVOR STEENERSON,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Referring to your letter of the 25th ultimo, and my reply of October 29, regarding statements by Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON during the debate on House joint resolution 151 on October 24 relative to the provision of law limiting the compensation of postmasters at offices of the fourth class to \$1,000, exclusive of money-order fees, I wish to say that the departmental files fail to show that your committee has ever been requested to consider legislation so amending the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat., 600; ch. 142), as to provide for advancement of an office from the fourth to a higher class prior to the expiration of one year in the lower grade. The statute referred to has been amended several times in recent years so as to provide increased compensation within the maximum of \$1,000 allowable to postmasters at offices of that class, but the provision for reclassifying such an office, which involves a readjustment of the postmaster's salary, has invariably restricted such advancement to the showing made by the office for "four consecutive quarters."

With reference to the Congressman's statement to the effect that he had been advised by Mr. Ellsworth, of this department, that the attention of your committee has been called to this matter, I am inclosing for your information memorandums submitted to me by Mr. Ellsworth, superintendent of the Division of Post Office Service, and Mr. W. S. Ryan, assistant superintendent of that division, covering interviews with the Congressman as accurately as is possible from memory.

In compliance with your request for advice as to the situation in the post office referred to by Mr. BLANTON, I wish to say that, while I do not know the name of the office in question, the departmental records fail to indicate the necessity for legislation to provide for payment in excess of the present maximum rate of \$1,000 per annum to postmasters at offices of the fourth class. The difficulty experienced by the department in securing postmasters has been negligible, and, while there have been a considerable number of resignations at the smaller offices, this condition is to be expected, and no serious difficulty has been experienced in filling vacancies thus caused.

You will appreciate the fact that the resignation of a postmaster at a small office, such as those of the fourth class, is not in any respect a serious matter and does not tend to materially impair the service.

The records show that the department has been very liberal in the matter of allowances out of the appropriation for unusual conditions for quarters and employment of clerical assistance at offices in the Texas oil fields, and it is my opinion that the service in that section has been and is at this time as good as could reasonably be expected, in view of

the phenomenal conditions and the almost insurmountable difficulties encountered in the delivery of the mails as a result of the transient nature of the population of the towns in the oil belt.

Very truly, yours,

A. S. BURLISON,
Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, October 28, 1919.

Memorandum.

Statements by Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON during the debate on H. J. Res. 151, on the 24th instant, are surprising. It is no doubt obvious that I would not advise a Congressman that legislation to provide for increasing the compensation of postmasters at offices of the fourth class had been requested of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. So far as I know, such legislation has never been contemplated by the department, nor has it ever been considered necessary to the proper administration of the Postal Service. It is a fact that in a very few isolated cases, where unusual conditions exist, such as is the case at this time with reference to perhaps two or three fourth-class post offices in the Texas oil fields, postmasters at such offices are required for a few months to perform a higher grade of service than is as a rule expected of postmasters of fourth-class offices. However, under the law an office of the fourth class may be advanced to the third, second, or first class if the receipts for four consecutive quarters warrant such advancement, and it has been the experience of the department that fourth-class offices which for a few months are burdened with extra duties on account of some unusual business activity are as a rule more than compensated for this hardship by the salary paid after the advancement of the office, as the business frequently declines shortly after such advancement, with the result that the postmaster during his second year of service is not required to perform duties commensurate with the salary paid. Nitro, W. Va., is a case in point, and several other similar ones could be cited.

Congressman BLANTON has been advised by me that the appropriation for unusual conditions could not be used to augment the compensation of a postmaster at an office of the fourth class, inasmuch as the law specifically limits the salary at such an office to \$1,000 per annum. The Congressman has been further advised that this appropriation was available for the employment of clerical assistance and rental of quarters at such offices, and this, as our records will show, has been done in every instance where the facts justified such action. In fact, with particular reference to the offices in the district represented by Mr. BLANTON, the files will show that the department has been very liberal in the matter of allowances, large sums having frequently been authorized by telegram on the request of the postmaster, without waiting to have an investigation made to determine the necessity for the expenditure of the amount requested.

The Congressman's statement relative to his efforts to secure aid from the department is astonishing. While he does not mention the number of visits made, the fact of having "worn out three pairs of shoes" in traveling to and from the department would indicate numerous calls. I would not attempt to hazard a guess as to the number of visits made to the department by Mr. BLANTON, but I think it is safe to say that he has not called at my office more than six times during the past six months. The files will show that he has written numerous letters concerning conditions at various offices in his district, and each communication received from him has been given very prompt and careful attention.

G. D. ELLSWORTH, Superintendent.

During the reading the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Can not we read the balance of that?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that out of the regular time the balance of the letter may be read.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Has not all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] has one minute remaining.

Mr. BLACK. I promised to yield that one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. STEENERSON. All right. We will print it in the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state it can not be done in the committee, the time for general debate having been fixed by the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the balance of the letter be also printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this whole controversy is based upon numerous requests I made of the Post Office Department to furnish proper service to the oil-belt offices in my district and to the people of Desdemona, Tex., which grew from a little town of about 100 people to a town of approximately 20,000 people in a very few months. You could hardly get a man to act as a fourth-class postmaster for a first-class office. As soon as I can get the time I will place the real facts connected with this matter before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated for the service of the Post Office Department, in conformity with the act of July 2, 1836, as follows:

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11578) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 10 days, on account of important business;

To Mr. ROWAN, for five days, on account of the sickness of his son;

To Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. SCOTT), for three days, on account of illness;

To Mr. RHODES (at the request of Mr. DYER), for two days, on account of illness; and

To Mr. JOHNSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. HADLEY), for the day, on account of illness.

LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks for the immediate consideration of the House concurrent resolution which he sends to the desk. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the time in which the joint special committee shall report, which committee was appointed under the provisions of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 14) of the present Congress authorizing the appointment of a joint special committee to confer with the officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and others relative to the participation by the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, be, and the same is hereby, extended until March 1, 1920.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] if this is the third or fourth or fifth extension?

Mr. WALSH. I will state to the gentleman that this is the third extension, and I feel very much humiliated to be compelled to ask the extension. But two distinguished Members of the other branch who are very busy Members have been absent, and the committee has been unable to convene and consider a report. We have been unable to get the views of all the Members, and it was felt that if we could have this present postponement the recommendation of the committee would be made long before the date fixed. I have made it sufficiently remote so as to provide for any further contingency that might arise.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman does not think that he will have to ask for any further extension of time?

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to say that I do not think it will be necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a division.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division is demanded.
The House divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 1.
So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 12, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the average number of employees of the Navy Department receiving the increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum during the first four months of the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 588); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition received from the inspectors and clerks of the Steamboat-Inspection Service at Cleveland, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 589); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State for contingent expenses and for foreign intercourse, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 590); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11239) granting an increase of pension to Marguerite Murphy, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 11633) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of public buildings at Providence, R. I., for use as a quarantine station; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 11634) providing for the appraisal of the value, the purchase of, and the operation of the pneumatic mail-tube properties in the city of Philadelphia and other cities where such equipment is now located; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11635) for the erection of a public building in Blairsville, Indiana County, State of Pennsylvania, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11636) for the erection of a public building in Kittanning, county seat of Armstrong County, Pa., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 11637) authorizing the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Keyser, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11638) authorizing the acquisition of a site at Berkeley Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 11639) to provide for the promotion of the senior major general on the active list of the United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 11640) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cemetery at Barren Hill, Montgomery County, Pa., one brass cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11641) to prevent deceit and profiteering that result from the unrevealed presence of substitutes for virgin wool in woven fabrics purporting to contain wool and in garments or articles of apparel made therefrom manufactured in any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 11642) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate the claim of any member of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) directing the retention of the pneumatic mail tube equipment in the Philadelphia and other post offices, pending legislation affecting same in Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 11643) granting a pension to Harriette Skelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 11644) for the relief of the heirs of John M. Corley; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11645) granting a pension to Sarah B. Jewett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 11646) granting a pension to Carrie E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11647) granting an increase of pension to William H. Willey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 11648) granting an increase of pension to John E. Coogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 11649) granting an increase of pension to Ellis Henthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11650) granting a pension to Gladys R. B. Scheib; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11651) granting a pension to Lucy J. Sheldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11652) granting an increase of pension to Philander S. Groesbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 11653) granting a pension to Luke C. Monroe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11654) granting an increase of pension to Marsh Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11655) granting an increase of pension to John S. Jamison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 11656) for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11657) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Lemuel C. Canfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 11658) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

785. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of the executive committee of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, indorsing House bill 11126, to save daylight in the first zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

786. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Rev. H. F. Fox and 34 other citizens of Urbana, Ohio, urging such legislation as will reduce the high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

787. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of members of the faculty of the veterinary division of the Michigan Agricultural College, in favor of reorganization of the Army Veterinary Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

788. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of S. J. McDonough, of Baltimore, Md., indorsing Mason resolution to establish consulates in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

789. Also, petition of the P. Dougherty Co., of Baltimore, Md., indorsing the Husted amendment to House bill 7124; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

790. Also, petition of National Central Bank and National Bank of Baltimore, Md., indorsing the Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

791. Also, petition of J. E. Kessler, of Relay, Md., and Sparrow Point Lodge, No. 63, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against passage of Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

792. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, advocating consular reforms; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

793. By Mr. RAKER: Petition from the San Francisco Council, Friends of Irish Freedom, indorsing the Mason resolution establishing diplomatic relations with the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

794. Also, copy of telegram from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

795. Also, petition of National Industrial Conference Board, transmitting resolutions relative to legislation regarding railroad strikes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

796. Also, petition of San Francisco Council, Friends of Irish Freedom, indorsing the Mason resolution to establish diplomatic relations with the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 12, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have not built a social order that can stand alone. Apart from Thy continued grace and favor we may not hope to perpetuate the institutions that have brought happiness and freedom to the millions of Thy children. We seek day by day Thy continued favor and grace that we may continue upon the path upon which we have committed ourselves, and that we may so work together with God that the largest prosperity and the finest and divinest peace may come to the people. We ask Thy blessing in this divine endeavor. For Christ's sake. Amen.

JAMES D. PHELAN, a Senator from the State of California, appeared in his seat to-day.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

THE VETO POWER.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER TO VETO PEACE.

"The Constitution provides a way to enact laws despite the veto of the President. But there is no way to make a treaty against the veto of the President. If there should be in the White House a President who did not wish to make peace after his treaty had been changed by the Senate, it might happen that the United States would be unable to reach a state of peace, except on terms laid down by a single individual and in defiance of Congress. There might be a President so wedded to his own plan, so entangled by promises to foreign Governments, or so jealous of the rights of the Senate that he would refuse to exchange ratifications of a peace treaty if the Senate had made reservations in behalf of this Nation. The reservations might be desirable and warmly approved by the people, but such a President could say, 'I do not accept the action of the Senate as the will of the people, and I refuse to approve of the Senate's work.' He would be within his constitutional powers, and could not be compelled to exchange ratifications of the treaty.

"By a two-thirds vote Congress can repass a bill over a President's veto, and it becomes law. The same provision should be made in case of a treaty after it has been approved by the Senate by the required two-thirds vote. Having reached that stage, it should not be pigeonholed by the President, and he should not have the power to pigeonhole it. If he should refuse to proceed with exchange of ratifications, Congress should have power to make the treaty effective by a two-thirds vote, as in case of a vetoed bill. A treaty is a law, and so far as it affects American citizens it is nothing but a law. Congress can abrogate a treaty by passing a law, with or without the President's consent, and this has been done several times. If a treaty and a law are in conflict, the Supreme Court takes the last expression as the law, whether it be the treaty or a simple act of Congress.

"It is conceivable that a President of the United States might be elected who would misuse his power to pigeonhole a

peace treaty, and thus keep the Nation in a state of war. A treaty is a contract between nations, and usually a peace treaty is a complicated bargain, the making of which required confidential exchanges between the parties, often leading to the making of secret pledges which must be kept from the knowledge of the people. In such a case the completed draft is apt to conceal as much as it reveals. It is also apt to be obscure, ambiguous, or even purposely misleading on important matters which have been disposed of secretly or which are to be handled privately by the Governments in a manner which would arouse antagonism or even war if known to the people. In that case the Senate would demand information and would not obtain it, or it would learn something indirectly which would cause it to make amendments or reservations for the sake of national security.

"Quite conceivably, amendments or reservations to a peace treaty would seem to be simple on their face and obviously unobjectionable, and yet they might vitally affect the pledges or commitments which a President had made privately to foreign Governments. The ambiguous language of a treaty might be so changed that instead of permitting a President to fulfill secret pledges it would disrupt the entire series of private understandings which has shaped the treaty. He would then be faced with the alternative of breaking his private agreements with foreign Governments or pigeonholing the treaty, notwithstanding his previous advocacy of it. He would possibly be able to convince some of his countrymen that the Senate's alterations had nullified the treaty, in which case he would have specious grounds for refusing to proceed with ratification; but, on the other hand, the people would probably insist upon ratification because of their anxiety to terminate the war. A stubborn President, however, could go to the end of his term without exchanging ratifications, notwithstanding the clamor of the people. Thus he could prove to foreign Governments his own personal good faith in endeavoring to secure ratification by the United States of a treaty with all its private implications and understandings unaffected by reservations or amendments.

"The present controversy over the treaty of Versailles has been valuable in bringing out the defect in the treaty-making power which is herein described. The truth is that the treaty-making power is not equally divided between the President and the Senate, since the President has an absolute veto. This lacuna should not be permitted to exist, for the reason that peace is usually reached by means of treaties, and it is unwise to leave to one man the power to continue a state of war against the will of the people and Congress.

"Congress can declare war with or without the President's consent, but it can not make peace by treaty without the President's consent. Surely if the Constitution makers found it desirable to empower Congress to overrule the President in making war, it would seem desirable that Congress should have power to overrule him in making peace by a treaty which he himself would have submitted."

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Md.
Borah	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Spencer
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Overman	Sutherland
Colt	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Culberson	Keyes	Phelan	Trammell
Curtis	King	Phipps	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lenroot	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	McCormick	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Sherman	
Hale	McKellar	Simmons	

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] are absent on official business.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are detained on official business.